

THE CHRONOLOGICAL  
ACCURACY OF THE *CHRONICLE*  
OF SYMEON THE LOGOTHETE  
FOR THE YEARS 813–845

WARREN T. TREADGOLD

“THE history of Byzantine civilization,” J. B. Bury wrote in 1912, “. . . will not be written for many years to come. It cannot be written until each successive epoch has been exhaustively studied and its distinguishing characteristics clearly ascertained.”<sup>1</sup> No Byzantinist would be likely to say that the task projected by Bury is close to being accomplished today, despite the misconception of a number of non-Byzantinists that the basic groundwork has now been laid in the Byzantine field. The book which Bury introduced with those words is still our standard work on the first half of the ninth century, or, as it is sometimes called after its longest-lived dynasty, the Amorian period. Most of the problems that Bury left unsolved remain unsolved. We still do not know the source of the vast wealth that was in the imperial treasury by 856, or even when it appeared. We do not know for certain whether the Patriarch John the Grammarian brought about the persecution of iconophiles in 832 or whether he was even patriarch then, or whether Manuel the Armenian brought about the restoration of the icons in 843 or whether he was even alive then. We are ill prepared to discuss Byzantine relations with the West when we are not sure whether the Caesar Alexius Musele made a major military expedition to the principality of Benevento or to Sicily. We are ill prepared to discuss Byzantine relations with the East without knowing under which emperor Thomas the Slav and Manuel, the greatest generals of their time, deserted to the Arabs, or which caliph invited Leo the Mathematician, the greatest scholar of his day, to teach at the Abbasid court. For this period, as for most others, the criticism that Byzantinists do not go beyond the basics of their discipline should take into account that they have not yet got so far.

The basic problem confronting students of the early ninth century has long been recognized, and has been summed up by Cyril Mango: “It is common knowledge that the narrative sources for the Amorian period are no earlier than the middle of the tenth century and are marred by confusion, ignorance, and even deliberate falsification.”<sup>2</sup> Until 813 the *Chronographia* of Theophanes Confessor supplies us with a contemporary account of the events of the late eighth and the beginning of the ninth centuries, which he recounts in some detail in annalistic form. For a few years after 813 we have another, probably contemporary history that now goes under the name of the *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio*.<sup>3</sup> When that ends we have the more or less contemporary

<sup>1</sup> *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802–867)* (London, 1912) (hereafter Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*), vii. After this article was completed, three works relevant to its subject appeared: the new edition of Genesius by A. Lesmüller-Werner and J. Thurn (Berlin-New York, 1978); A. Markopoulos, *Ἡ Χρονογραφία τοῦ Ψευδοσυμεῶν καὶ οἱ πηγὲς τῆς* (diss. Jannina, 1978); and H. Hunger, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Munich, 1978), which includes discussions of and updated bibliography on all surviving chronicles mentioned here. Fortunately, nothing in these works required modification of my analysis.

<sup>2</sup> “When Was Michael III Born?,” *DOP*, 21 (1967), 253.

<sup>3</sup> See R. Browning, “Notes on the ‘Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio,’” *Byzantion*, 35 (1965), 389–411.

*Chronicle* of George the Monk until 867, but especially after 829 it is less a chronicle than a vapid diatribe against Iconoclasm, providing scarcely any historical facts. After George we possess no narrative histories until we come to the works of four writers of the mid-tenth century: Symeon the Logothete, the Pseudo-Symeon, Joseph Genesisius, and Theophanes Continuatus. In recounting the events that occurred a hundred years or more before their time, the first two disagree repeatedly and irreconcilably with the latter two, and all show traces of confusion. As a result, modern scholars have adopted one or the other or none of their versions case by case, and are always conjecturing dates. Genesisius and the Continuer of Theophanes have been convicted of chronological confusion and deliberate falsification so glaring that Henri Grégoire concluded, "Il faut les lire avec la plus extrême méfiance et les croire capables de tout."<sup>4</sup> The Pseudo-Symeon is based on the work of Symeon, into which he has recklessly interpolated arbitrary dates by regnal years.<sup>5</sup> This leaves the *Chronicle* of the Logothete as, at the very least, the best of a bad lot of sources for the years after the mid-teens of the ninth century.

For the later ninth and early tenth centuries the late Romilly Jenkins has shown that Symeon's *Chronicle* is far better than this. It was his masterful article in the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* for 1965, "The Chronological Accuracy of the 'Logothete' for the Years A.D. 867-913," that served as the inspiration for the present study. Jenkins argued that Symeon compiled his account of the reigns of Basil I, Leo VI, and Alexander from a series of contemporary annals. Using the usual medieval chronicler's method of turning an annalistic source into a chronicle, the Logothete not only omitted the original indications of years but deliberately displaced certain events from their chronological sequence in order to show how they led up to other events or followed from them. For example, the Logothete mentions in its proper place the return of Constantine Ducas from Baghdad in 907/8, but then refers back to the revolt of Constantine's father Andronicus in 905 and its suppression in 907, which had caused both Andronicus and Constantine to flee to Baghdad in the first place. For another example, Symeon records in its proper sequence the imprisonment of Leo VI by Basil I in 883, then refers forward to Leo's release in 886 before continuing his story from 883.<sup>6</sup> The former practice Jenkins called a "cast back," the latter a "cast forward."

Anticipating the objection that this sort of analysis could lead to justifying almost any sequence of events, Jenkins defined the test of the chronological accuracy of a chronicle composed in this way as follows: each entry with only one event must be in correct sequence, and at least one event in each entry with more than one event must follow the preceding entry and precede the

<sup>4</sup> "Manuel et Théophobe, ou la concurrence de deux monastères," *Byzantion*, 9 (1934), 204.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Chronological Accuracy of the 'Logothete' for the Years A.D. 867-913," *DOP*, 19 (1965), 91 note 3; and Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 459.

<sup>6</sup> Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 92-93, cf. 101-3. It is nearly certain that Symeon the Logothete was identical with Symeon the Metaphrast, was born before 912, compiled his *Chronicle* about 948, and died after 987. See N. Oikonomides, "Two Seals of Symeon Metaphrastes," *DOP*, 27 (1973), 323-26; and I. Ševčenko, "Poems on the Deaths of Leo VI and Constantine VII in the Madrid Manuscripts of Scylitzes," *DOP*, 23-24 (1969-70), 215-20.

following entry.<sup>7</sup> In practice, Jenkins applied a considerably more rigorous test than this. He considered as single entries only events with an obvious connection with each other, and counted as reference points within entries only events of obvious importance for their stories. Jenkins concluded that according to these rules the Logothete's account of the years 867–913 contains no chronological errors whatever. However, when Jenkins applied the scheme to earlier and later parts of the Logothete's *Chronicle*, he found several errors in the sequence of events after 913 and repeated errors in the sequence from 856 to 867.<sup>8</sup> Jenkins does not seem to have checked the part of Symeon's *Chronicle* before 856. This I now propose to do.

It is a somewhat more difficult task to check the years from 813 to 856 than later years, because we have fewer fixed dates in the earlier period on which we can rely. But we do have some, particularly from the Arabic chronicles, which go back to early sources and give specific dates for the major battles between Arabs and Byzantines. The dates of at least the beginnings and ends of reigns are known, usually from a *Necrologium* derived from the *De caerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, an official source.<sup>9</sup> Further, we possess some early sources that are not histories—saints' Lives, letters, inscriptions, and so on—that can be used to check dates even if they do not give them exactly. This information is certainly sufficient to show whether a chronicle is making a creditable attempt to present its material in chronological order. For instance, it is more than enough to prove that the Pseudo-Symeon has inserted his exact dates arbitrarily. Our chronological data also show that the inaccuracies in Symeon's sequence of events go back at least to his entries on the mid-840's; the Logothete recounts the death of the Patriarch Methodius, which took place in 847, *after* the marriage of Michael III, which took place about 855.<sup>10</sup> For the years from 813 to 847, however, Symeon recounts the events that have been securely dated in their correct order.

For the events that have not yet been securely dated, which account for the majority of Symeon's entries for these years, he can only be compared to other sources whose reliability is questionable. Among these is the Syriac *Chronicle* of the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch Michael the Syrian (1126–99).<sup>11</sup> For most of this period, Michael's principal source was the lost Syriac *Chronicle* of the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch Dionysius of Tellmahṛē, who died in 845 and concluded his work with the death of Theophilus in 842.<sup>12</sup> Though Dionysius was an early source, he seems to have been very badly informed about contemporary events in Byzantium, because Michael's account up to

<sup>7</sup> Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 93.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 94–95.

<sup>9</sup> P. Grierson, "The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors," with an additional note by C. Mango and I. Ševčenko, *DOP*, 16 (1962), 1–63.

<sup>10</sup> See *infra*, note 167.

<sup>11</sup> See A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), 298–300.

<sup>12</sup> On Dionysius and Michael's dependence on him, see *ibid.*, 274–75; cf. J.-B. Chabot, trans., *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, III (Paris, 1905), 104.



842 is full of ludicrous mistakes.<sup>13</sup> After 842 Michael's principal source was another Syriac chronicler, Ignatius, bishop of Melitene, who died in 1104 and thus wrote later than our Greek chroniclers.<sup>14</sup> In fact, in a preface quoted by Michael, Ignatius mentions that he made extensive use of Greek chronicles, though his account of this period still seems to have been marked by errors and ignorance.<sup>15</sup> Michael the Syrian in turn served as the main source of the later Syriac chronicler Bar-Hebraeus (1225/26–1286), who appears to have no independent value for our purposes.<sup>16</sup> In general, when Michael the Syrian and the Greek sources disagree, the Greek sources are to be preferred.

Since the Pseudo-Symeon is based on Symeon, Genesius and Theophanes Continuatus are left as the principal independent chroniclers to whom Symeon can be compared. Genesius and the Continuer are closely related to each other, because they used some common sources and the Continuer used Genesius.<sup>17</sup> Neither of them presents his material in chronological order or pretends to do so. Genesius will often give two accounts of the same event one after the other, noting which he considers the more reliable; the Continuer sometimes uses this method also. Further, the Continuer has arranged his material by topics, so that little if anything can be gathered from the order in which it is presented. Still, these two sources often make explicit statements which contradict the Logothete's chronology. For example, they report that the revolt of Thomas the Slav began under Leo V, though Symeon says that it occurred only under Michael II; and that Leo the Mathematician was invited to come to the caliphate by the Caliph Al-Ma'mūn, while the Logothete says that the invitation was made after the capture of Amorium, in the caliphate of Ma'mūn's successor, Al-Mu'tasim. The most striking divergence is between Symeon's report that the general Manuel died of wounds received in the battle of Anzen in 838 and the report of Genesius and the Continuer that Manuel died about 860 after fighting in a second battle of Anzen in the late 850's. In trying to determine which of these versions is correct, we should not be influenced by later, wholly derivative accounts. For example, since for this

<sup>13</sup> To list Michael's worst errors, he records that Nicephorus I was assassinated by a Byzantine (trans. Chabot, 17), though he was actually killed in a battle with the Bulgarians; that Stauracius was mortally wounded by the Bulgarians at the end of his reign (*ibid.*, 25–26), though this happened at the beginning; that Leo V defeated the Bulgarians before he became emperor (*ibid.*, 26), though he defeated them afterward; that Michael I abdicated voluntarily in favor of Leo (*ibid.*, 70–71), though his abdication was by no means voluntary; that under Leo, the Patriarch Nicephorus introduced the new heresy of worshiping images (*ibid.*, 71–72), though Nicephorus' iconophilism was no heresy even by Monophysite standards; that Leo was murdered on Good Friday (*ibid.*, 72), though he was murdered on Christmas; and that Michael II was of Jewish stock and married the granddaughter of Constantine VI, who murdered her son by Michael out of anti-Semitism (*ibid.*, 72), though Michael married Constantine's daughter Euphrosyne and the rest of the story is wildly improbable.

<sup>14</sup> See Baumstark, *op. cit.*, 291; and Michael, trans. Chabot, 116, 112.

<sup>15</sup> See Michael, trans. Chabot, 115. To continue the catalogue of Michael's errors, he reports that Theodora died in 855 and left Michael III to rule alone (*ibid.*, 113), though he deposed her and relegated her to a monastery; and that the patriarch chosen by Theodora to restore the icons, Methodius, was later deposed for practicing magic and idolatry (*ibid.*, 114–16), which is nonsense. Michael later quotes Ignatius as saying that he could not find in his Greek sources how many years Basil I had reigned (*ibid.*, 117).

<sup>16</sup> See Baumstark, *op. cit.*, 312–20; and E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj*, I (London, 1932), vi, xxxvii–xxxviii.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 460–61.

period the histories of John Scylitzes and John Zonaras are based on Theophanes Continuatus, the fact that they give the same versions of events proves nothing.

In order to check the Logothete's chronology, I have arranged his entries for the years from 813 to 845 in two chronological tables, one for the reigns of Leo V and Michael II, another for the reigns of Theophilus and Michael III. I shall argue in due course that the division between the two tables at the year 829 corresponds to a division between two sources used by Symeon. Within each entry that includes more than one event, the event that the Logothete evidently used as a reference point appears first, followed by events that Symeon apparently included in a "cast forward" or a "cast back"; these also appear in the order in which he gives them. Thus, the tables present what seems to be the chronological scheme of the *Chronicle*. If these sections of the work are chronologically accurate, all the main entries should be in chronological order, and the events in "casts forward" or "casts back" should be in chronological order within each entry. Opposite the main event in each entry, and after each subordinate event within the entry, the tables give the date of the event as far as I have been able to determine it. The text following each table discusses the sources for these dates. Note that if all the dates presented here are correct, this part of Symeon's work is arranged in perfect chronological order.

Unfortunately, no satisfactory edition of the text of the Logothete's *Chronicle* exists. Gyula Moravcsik has listed four manuscripts of the original *Chronicle*, seven manuscripts of the *Chronicle* of George the Monk into which large parts of Symeon's *Chronicle* have been interpolated, one manuscript of a plagiarization of Symeon by Leo the Grammarian, one manuscript of another plagiarization by Theodosius Melissenus, one manuscript of a Slavonic translation of the original, and one manuscript of a Slavonic translation of the interpolated George the Monk. Of these fifteen manuscripts, five have been edited, all separately: two of the interpolated George and those of Leo, Theodosius, and the Slavonic translation of the original.<sup>18</sup> In preparing this article, I have consulted all four published Greek versions and a microfilm of one of the manuscripts of the original *Chronicle* (*Vaticanus Graecus* 1807). Though in his article Jenkins referred to the interpolated George edited in the Bonn Corpus, for our period this version mixes the text of the real George with that of Symeon and omits some of Symeon's, so that it is not suitable for our purposes. Therefore references are made here to the Bonn edition of Leo the Grammarian, with references given to the Bonn edition of the interpolated George for a few

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion of the MSS, and a comprehensive edition of a portion of the *Chronicle* that begins just after the part treated here, see Gy. Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden über Kaiser Basileios I.," *DOP*, 15 (1961), 110–22. To call the *Chronicle* "Georgius Continuatus," as Moravcsik does, is misleading, because the Logothete compiled it entirely independently of George, as we shall see. Otto Kresten has now established that "Theodosius Melissenus" is the correct form of the name of the plagiarist formerly known as "Theodosius Melitenus"; "Phantomgestalten in der byzantinischen Literaturgeschichte," *JÖB*, 25 (1976), 208–12.

passages where the text of Leo is defective.<sup>19</sup> A comprehensive edition of the Logothete's *Chronicle*, based on a sound analysis of the relationship of all the manuscripts to each other, difficult though it would be, would provide benefits to historians that would justify the trouble and labor. It seems unlikely, however, that such an edition would require more than a slight adjustment of the following chronological analysis.

## TABLE I

("Leo Grammaticus," Bonn ed., 207.6–213.6)<sup>20</sup>

## REIGN OF LEO V THE ARMENIAN

207.7–8: Leo reigned seven years, five months.

- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| 1. 207.8–9: Leo is crowned.  | July 11, 813     |
| 2. 207.9–208.2: Bulgarians besiege Constantinople.   | July 16, 813     |
| 3. 208.2–9: Bulgarians sack Hadrianople.   | early fall 813   |
| 4. 208.9–209.16: Leo exiles Patriarch Nicephorus and makes Theodotus patriarch (cast back to comet [November 4, 812], fires and other disasters [from summer 813], appointment of iconoclast commission [June 4, 814], and meeting of iconophiles with Leo [January 815]). | April 1, 815     |
| 5. 209.16–210.4: Leo persecutes iconophiles.   | 815–20           |
| 6. 210.4–211.5: Leo imprisons Michael the Amorian but is killed by Michael's friends.  | December 25, 820 |

## REIGN OF MICHAEL II THE AMORIAN

211.7: Michael reigned eight years, nine months.

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. 211.7–12: Michael relaxes persecution of iconophiles.   | early 821                 |
| 2. 211.13–17: Michael confirms ecclesiastical legislation of Leo.  | early 821                 |
| 3. 211.17–18: Michael crowns son Theophilus.   | March 24 or May 12, 821   |
| 4. 211.18–212.7: Thomas the Slav marches on Constantinople (cast back to Thomas' flight to Syria [early 821]). | October/November 821      |
| 5. 212.7–10: Thomas besieges Constantinople for one year.  | December 821–November 822 |
| 6. 212.11–12: Thomas abandons siege and plunders Thrace.   | November 822              |

<sup>19</sup> The best text is actually that of Theodosius Melissenus, ed. (as "Theodosius Melitenus") Th. Tafel (Munich 1859), which is more complete than Leo's for this period and is not interpolated; but since this edition is difficult to obtain and its lines are not numbered for easy reference, I have referred to the Bonn editions here, giving variant readings when necessary.

<sup>20</sup> Theod. Mel., 143–47; *Vat. Gr.* 1807, fols. 52<sup>v</sup>–54<sup>r</sup>.

7. 212.12–17: Michael defeats and kills Thomas, mid-October 823  
ending revolt after three years.
8. 212.18–213.2: Arabs make conquests in Crete, 826–28  
Sicily, and the Cyclades.
9. 213.2–6: Michael dies and is succeeded by October 2, 829  
Theophilus and Euphrosyne.

Throughout his *Chronicle* Symeon begins his accounts of emperors by giving the length of their reigns, and in the case of Leo V he is correct to the nearest month. In fact, Leo reigned seven years, five months, and fourteen days. The date of Leo's accession is known from Theophanes, a contemporary source.<sup>21</sup> Both Theophanes and the Logothete himself note that the Bulgarian siege of Constantinople began on the sixth day after Leo's accession, i.e., on July 16.<sup>22</sup> Though the exact date of the sack of Hadrianople is not recorded, all our sources indicate a date in the early autumn of 813.<sup>23</sup>

Symeon then begins an account of Leo's reintroduction of Iconoclasm, for which his reference point is Leo's exile of the Patriarch Nicephorus and appointment of Theodotus Cassiteras as patriarch on Easter Sunday (April 1) 815.<sup>24</sup> This event is followed by a cast back to the appearance of a comet in the form of a headless man, which Theophanes dates to November 4, 812, still under Michael I.<sup>25</sup> Though Theophanes took this comet, obviously a bad omen, to foreshadow the advance of the Bulgarians, in Symeon it is taken as a portent of the more serious disaster of Leo's Iconoclasm, which was not yet evident at the time Theophanes wrote. The Logothete goes on to refer vaguely to earthquakes, droughts, and fires that occurred during Leo's reign. The fires are no doubt those set by the Bulgarian Khan Krum when he burned the suburbs of Constantinople and the town of Rodosto in the summer of 813.<sup>26</sup> To the extent that the other disasters are not pious iconophile exaggerations, they are presumably to be dated to the same time, or not long afterward. The next event in the cast back is Leo's appointment of a commission of iconoclasts under John the Grammarian to study the question of the icons, which Leo did on Pentecost (June 4) 814.<sup>27</sup> After this, the Logothete mentions the meeting held between Leo and Nicephorus, Euthymius of Sardis, and Theodore of Studium in January of 815.<sup>28</sup> Finally, Symeon rounds off his cast back by referring again to the exile of Nicephorus and Theodore and the appointment of Theodotus, with which he began.

His next entry is a short account of Leo's persecution of iconophiles, which lasted for the rest of his reign. The last entry of the reign is naturally Leo's

<sup>21</sup> Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I (Leipzig, 1883), 502.29.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 503.7–8; Leo Gramm., 207.11–12.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 356–57.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. V. Grumel, *La Chronologie* (Paris, 1958), 435.

<sup>25</sup> Theophanes, 499.5; cf. *infra*, p. 170.

<sup>26</sup> Scriptor Incertus, Bonn ed. (with Leo Grammaticus, 1842), 344–45.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 352.4–6.

<sup>28</sup> See Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 64–67, who collects the sources and shows that the meeting took place after Epiphany (January 6) and a number of days before the beginning of Lent (February 18).

murder by the friends of Michael the Amorian, whom Leo had imprisoned and was about to execute for disloyalty. As the Logothete notes, this occurred on Christmas; the year was 820.<sup>29</sup>

Symeon begins his account of Michael II's reign by reporting the length of the reign correctly to the nearest month, since Michael ruled for eight years, nine months, and seven days. Although the first two entries for this reign cannot be dated exactly, all sources agree with Symeon that their events, Michael's relaxation of the persecution and confirmation of Iconoclasm, belong to the beginning of his rule. The date accepted by most modern scholars for Michael's coronation of Theophilus, the next entry in the Logothete's account, is Pentecost (May 12) 821, which would in fact fit the Logothete's order. However, this date is based on the unwarranted conjecture of E. W. Brooks that Symeon's description of the marriage of Theophilus on Pentecost 830 actually belongs to the time of Theophilus' coronation.<sup>30</sup> The evidence must be rechecked.

The will of Giustiniano Partecipazio, doge of Venice (827–29), is dated to the seventh year of the indiction—which ran from September 1, 828, to August 31, 829—and to the ninth year of Michael II and the eighth year of Theophilus.<sup>31</sup> From this it is plain that Theophilus was crowned after his father and before September 1, 822. Since Michael had time to issue coins of himself as sole emperor, he must have waited at least a month or two before crowning his son. Beyond this, an inscription on the outside of the Blachernae walls that refers to "Michael and Theophilus, the great emperors" is accompanied by the date A.M. 6330, which corresponds to the twelve months after September 1, 821.<sup>32</sup> But no one is likely to have put an inscription on the outside of the land walls after Thomas the Slav began his year-long siege of Constantinople in December 821.<sup>33</sup> Evidently, this inscription marks repairs made to the walls in anticipation of the siege. Indeed, if the Logothete's order is trustworthy, the coronation of Theophilus took place before Thomas' march on Constantinople in October or November of 821. Now, in every case in the Middle Byzantine period for which we have precise information, emperors crowned their sons on Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, or Pentecost.<sup>34</sup> If Michael II did not

<sup>29</sup> Grierson, *op. cit.* (note 9 *supra*), 56.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. E. W. Brooks, "The Marriage of the Emperor Theophilus," *BZ*, 10 (1901), 540–45, followed by most later scholars. For a refutation, see W. Treadgold, "The Problem of the Marriage of the Emperor Theophilus," *GRBS*, 16 (1975) (hereafter Treadgold, "Problem"), 325–41.

<sup>31</sup> S. Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, I (Venice, 1853), 348 and note 1. For *octavo decimo* read simply *octavo*. The will is cited and emended by Brooks, *op. cit.*, 542.

<sup>32</sup> B. Meyer-Plath and A. M. Schneider, *Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel*, II (Berlin, 1943), 141, no. 64.

<sup>33</sup> See P. Lemerle, "Thomas le Slave," *TM*, 1 (1965), 291.

<sup>34</sup> P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, II, 2 (Washington, D.C., 1968), 402, mentions the custom, and gives the following data in his catalogues: Constans II probably crowned Constantine IV on Easter 654 and Heraclius and Tiberius on Pentecost 659 (*ibid.*, 402); Leo III crowned Constantine V on Easter 720 (*ibid.*, III, 1 [Washington, D.C., 1973], 226); Constantine V crowned Leo IV on Pentecost 751 (*ibid.*, 290); Leo IV crowned Constantine VI on Easter 776 (*ibid.*, 325); Nicephorus I probably crowned Stauracius on Christmas 803 (*ibid.*, 352); Michael I crowned Theophylact on Christmas 811 (*ibid.*, 363); Leo V crowned Constantine on a feast that was probably Christmas 813 (*ibid.*, 371); Michael III crowned his adopted son Basil I (cf. Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed. [1838], 238) on Pentecost 866 (Grierson, *Cata-*

break this custom, he crowned Theophilus either on Easter (March 24) or Pentecost (May 12) of 821. Whichever day it was, Theophilus was then eight years old.<sup>35</sup>

The evidence for the revolt of Thomas, which is the subject of the Logothete's next four entries, has been carefully sifted by Paul Lemerle. In a cast back in the first of his entries on the subject the Logothete notes that Thomas had gone over to the Arabs and begun his revolt earlier, but still under Michael II. This agrees with a tradition in the Byzantine sources that is also represented by George the Monk, The *Acta Davidis*, and accounts recorded but rejected by Genesius and Theophanes Continuatus. Another Byzantine tradition, according to which Thomas fled to the Arabs and began his revolt under Leo V, is represented by a letter from Michael II to Louis the Pious and the accounts adopted by Genesius and the Continuer. Finally, Michael the Syrian records that Thomas had been among the Arabs and nominally in revolt against the Byzantines since the caliphate of Hārūn al-Rashīd (786–809). Lemerle has demonstrated that the tradition followed by Symeon is correct, that the second tradition is based on an attempt by Michael II to conceal the fact that his overthrow of Leo V was the real cause of Thomas' revolt, and that Michael the Syrian's statements about Thomas are "caricatures de l'histoire."<sup>36</sup> Thus, the Logothete is ranged on the side of the best sources, against Genesius, Theophanes Continuatus, and Michael the Syrian. Lemerle has also established dates for the rest of the revolt of Thomas that correspond exactly with the entries in Symeon's *Chronicle*. These are given in Table I.

Even more than the rest of this part of his work, Symeon's entries on the Arab conquests in Crete, Sicily, and the Cyclades are abbreviated, for they are only a single sentence. Although perhaps the point should not be pressed, his list of the three conquests still seems to be in order. According to Vasiliev, the Arabs probably began their conquest of Crete in 826 and of Sicily in 827, and took the Aegean islands after completing their conquest of Crete in 828.<sup>37</sup> After this, the Logothete ends his account of the reign by recording Michael's death from kidney failure, which according to the imperial *Necrologium* took place on October 2, 829.<sup>38</sup> In sum, the order of Symeon's entries for the reigns of Leo V and Michael II can be demonstrated to be chronologically correct in every case.

---

*logue*, III,1, 452); Basil I crowned Constantine perhaps on Epiphany 868 (*ibid.*, III,2, 474) and crowned Leo VI on Epiphany 870 (*ibid.*, 474–75); Leo VI crowned Constantine VII on Pentecost 908 (*ibid.*, 507–8); Constantine VII crowned Romanus I's son Christopher on Pentecost 921 (*ibid.*, 528); Romanus I crowned Stephen and Constantine on Christmas 924 (*ibid.*, 528); Constantine VII crowned Romanus II on Easter 945 (*ibid.*, 529); and Romanus II crowned Basil II on Easter 960 and Constantine VII probably on Easter 962 (*ibid.*, 575). The days of the coronation of Tiberius by Justinian II in 705, of Nicephorus by Artabasdu in 742, and of Alexander by Basil I in 879 are unknown, like those of Theophilus' coronations of Constantine and Michael III (but see *infra*, p. 189).

<sup>35</sup> On Theophilus' age, see Treadgold, "Problem," 335–38.

<sup>36</sup> Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 255–97.

<sup>37</sup> A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, I (Brussels, 1935) (hereafter Vasiliev, *Byzance*), 49–88, 438.

<sup>38</sup> Grierson, "Tombs" (note 9 *supra*), 56.

This being established, an explanation must be found for the fact that this portion of Symeon's *Chronicle* is filled with verbal parallels to the *Chronicle* of George the Monk, which ends in 867 and was evidently composed during the reign of Michael III.<sup>39</sup> Though George omits Symeon's first three entries for the reign of Leo and begins with the fourth, a simple comparison of the two chroniclers' accounts of the deposition of Nicephorus and the elevation of Theodotus should be enough to prove the point:

Ὁ δὲ Λέων μετὰ δύο χρόνους τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας μανεῖς, καὶ τὸν στέφαντα αὐτὸν θεῖον Νικηφόρον ἐξορίσας, Θεόδοτον πατριάρχην ἀντιχειροτονεῖ, ἄλογον ἄνδρα καὶ ἰχθύων ἀφωνότερον, καὶ διωγμὸν ἄσπονδον κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνερρίπισεν. "Leo Grammaticus," 208.9–13.<sup>40</sup>

...ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ δύστηνος οὗτος καὶ ἀντίθεος μετὰ δύο ἔτη κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας μανεῖς καὶ λυσσῆσας καὶ τὸν στέφαντα αὐτὸν θεῖον Νικηφόρον ἐξορίσας καὶ Θεόδοτον πατριάρχην δῆθεν ἀντιχειροτονήσας, ἄλογον ἄνδρα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνδράποδον καὶ ἀφωνότερον τῶν ἰχθύων καὶ μηδὲν πλέον τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐπιστάμενον, διωγμὸν ἄσπονδον κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνερρίπισεν. Georgius Monachus (ed. de Boor), 777.8–15.

Though Bury assumed that the Logothete had used George as a source, this explanation runs up against several serious objections.<sup>41</sup> First, it cannot explain why there are no parallels between Symeon's accounts of Theophilus and Michael III and those parts of George's *Chronicle*. Second, it does not explain how Symeon was able to fit into their proper places several events not mentioned by George, including the Bulgarian attacks of 813, the coronation of Theophilus, and Thomas the Slav's raid in Thrace.<sup>42</sup> The Logothete would also have had to insert in their right place the Arab conquests in Crete, Sicily, and the Cyclades, which George mentions only under the reign of Theophilus.<sup>43</sup> Besides, in some places Symeon is more complete than George, yet his text shows no signs of his having combined two sources.

The only plausible explanation is that Symeon and George drew on a common source. The Logothete seems to have followed this source very closely; George omitted the purely political events in it, except for disasters that revealed God's wrath at Iconoclasm, and expanded the ecclesiastical events with additional anti-iconoclastic polemic, scriptural quotations, quotations from Eusebius and Nicephorus, a pejorative genealogy of Leo V, and what appear to be very meager factual contributions of his own.<sup>44</sup>

An examination of the portions of the chronicles of Symeon and George that cover the four reigns before Leo V's makes this conjecture seem certain.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., I (Berlin, 1958), 277.

<sup>40</sup> Same text in Theod. Mel., 143; and *Vat. Gr.* 1807, fol. 52<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 457.

<sup>42</sup> Of the entries listed in Table I, George omits 1–3 under Leo V and 3 and 6 under Michael II.

<sup>43</sup> George the Monk, *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1904), II, 798.1–3; George also mentions the death of Michael II at the beginning of his reign (*ibid.*, 792.8–9).

<sup>44</sup> The genealogy appears *ibid.*, pp. 780–82, the quotations from Nicephorus are on p. 780, those from Eusebius on p. 786.

Here both follow the *Chronographia* of Theophanes, but they contain many similar paraphrases of him and a few common additions to him. The Logothete cannot simply have used George, because his chronicle is consistently more extensive than George's, narrating many events included by Theophanes that George omits. Since Symeon follows the annalistic account of Theophanes for these years, naturally he is chronologically accurate. In fact, in both Symeon and George we can trace the chronicler's method defined by Jenkins, because the events in the *Chronographia* are sometimes rearranged by grouping related events under the entry of the most important event of their story. For example, after recording Constantine VI's repudiation of his wife Maria, dated by Theophanes to January 3, 795, both Symeon and George mention Constantine's marriage to Theodote, dated by Theophanes to September 795. The account of both chroniclers then casts forward in Theophanes' account to 796, when Abbot Plato of Saccudium excommunicated the Patriarch Tarasius for allowing Constantine's remarriage, and was consequently punished by Constantine and protected by Irene. After this cast forward, the Logothete's account returns to its reference point in Theophanes, Constantine's remarriage, and records Constantine's defeat of the Bulgarians later in 795, though this preceded Plato's punishment both in Theophanes and in fact.<sup>45</sup>

The additions that are made to Theophanes in both George and the Logothete are fitted into Theophanes' order. Some are simply attached to other entries, as when the Logothete adds to Theophanes' story of a fire that destroyed the patriarchate in December 790 the fact that the exegetical works of John Chrysostom had been kept there.<sup>46</sup> But under the reign of Nicephorus a complete entry is added. After the beginning of the revolt of Bardanes Turcus on July 19, 803, and before the death of Irene on August 9, both Symeon and George mention an invasion by the Arab caliph that reached north-west Asia Minor, but was turned back by negotiations conducted by Nicephorus.<sup>47</sup> George, but not Symeon, says that this occurred in Nicephorus' third year, or 805/6; however, this contradicts not only the sequence of events in both chronicles but the probable facts. Bury concluded from Arab sources and Michael the Syrian (who is a better source for Arab than for Byzantine history) that Hārūn Al-Rashīd was persuaded by Nicephorus to withdraw from Asia Minor at the time of the revolt of Bardanes in 803, just where the chronicles put the incident.<sup>48</sup> Here, as usual, the Logothete proves a better transmitter than George of their common source, to which George evidently added an incorrect date in this case.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Theophanes, 469–71, with Leo Gramm., 198–99 (Leo misspells "Saccudium" as "Saducium," but Theod. Mel., 137, spells it correctly) and George (ed. de Boor), 770 (George omits the defeat of the Bulgarians).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Theophanes, 467, with Leo Gramm., 197; George omits this.

<sup>47</sup> Leo Gramm., 203–4; George, 772–73.

<sup>48</sup> See Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 249–50. Cf. Michael (trans. Chabot, 16), who dates these events to the year 1114 of the Seleucid Era, ending September 30, 803. The most recent treatment is M. Canard, "La Prise d'Héraclée et les relations entre Hārūn ar-Rashīd et l'empereur Nicéphore Ier," *Byzantion*, 32 (1962), 345–79. Canard is skeptical about the evidently misdated account of George (*ibid.*, 348–49), but is inclined to accept the account of Michael (*ibid.*, 372–76).



This lost chronicle is evidently the same as the elusive "Epitome" postulated by several scholars who have studied the text of Symeon's *Chronicle*. Their conclusions, summed up by Moravcsik, were that the "Epitome" probably continued the lost chronicle of Trajanus from the time of Justinian II to 842, served as the source of the Logothete until that date, and was related to Theophanes and George the Monk in undetermined ways.<sup>49</sup> Whether the lost chronicle that I have postulated was a continuation of Trajanus is a question that goes beyond the scope of this article, but we can determine a number of other things about it. To begin with, it put Theophanes into the form of a more polished chronicle by omitting his dates and rearranging his events into casts forward and casts back. It also interpolated Theophanes, with chronological accuracy in the case of Hārūn's invasion, and continued his account, again with chronological accuracy, until 829 (*not* 842), when the parallels between George and Symeon end. The chronicler was interested in ecclesiastical history, which both George and Symeon copied from him, and in political and military history, most of which only Symeon copied. As in Symeon's version, the original chronicle appears to have been fairly brief; before 813, Symeon consistently reproduces more of it than George, and after 813 the additional material in George's *Chronicle* seems to have been added by George himself.

The original chronicler was obviously an iconophile. He took a more favorable view of Nicephorus than Theophanes did, for he insists that Nicephorus did not break his pledge to Bardanes Turcus by ordering him blinded, as Theophanes asserts, but that this was done against the emperor's will.<sup>50</sup> He also mentions that the caliph was amazed at Nicephorus' skill in negotiation at the time of the Arab invasion of 803. Our chronicler used the *Life of Nicetas of Medikium*, composed before the death of Michael I in 844/45.<sup>51</sup> He himself wrote after that event, which he mentioned under Michael's reign in a passage common to Symeon and George.<sup>52</sup> Certainly he wrote in time for George to use him, and so before 867.<sup>53</sup> We may call his work simply Chronicle A. Though it is not a very full source for this period, it is a good one, which can add some information even before 813.

Thus, Symeon chose his source well and generally transmitted it accurately. He seems, however, to have made two mistakes, neither of which affects the sequence of events. First, unless our texts of his *Chronicle* are at fault here, the Logothete did not realize that the cast back to the comet in his fourth entry for Leo V goes all the way back to the previous reign of Michael I.<sup>54</sup> In

<sup>49</sup> *Byzantinoturcica*, I, 515–18, including earlier bibliography.

<sup>50</sup> Theophanes, 480; Leo Gramm., 202–3; George, 772.

<sup>51</sup> For the parallels between George and Theosterictus, see de Boor's references in his edition of George; for the date, see I. Ševčenko, "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, 1977), 118 and note 42.

<sup>52</sup> Leo Gramm., 207.3; George, 776.23–24.

<sup>53</sup> His date is discussed further, *infra*, p. 194.

<sup>54</sup> Leo Gramm., 209.1, introduces the report of the comet with ἐκ τότε ("thereafter"), which makes the error worse, but Theod. Mel., 143, *Vat. Gr.* 1807, fol. 52v, and the interpolated George the Monk (Bonn ed., 765.16, and ed. Murlat, 681) all read ἐφ' οὗ (i.e., under Leo). The passage also misled George, who uses a different word, τῇ καὶ τότε ("at that time") (ed. de Boor, 777.21).

copying a chronicle which carefully left out specific dates, such an error would have been easy to make. Second, Symeon states that Theophilus was Michael II's son by Euphrosyne, though Theophilus' mother was actually Michael's first wife, Thecla. Since Thecla is mentioned nowhere in what we know of Chronicle A or indeed in any Greek chronicle, it seems likely that Symeon read in his source that Euphrosyne was Michael's wife and that Theophilus was Michael's child—which led him to the reasonable but mistaken deduction that Euphrosyne was Theophilus' mother.<sup>55</sup> These are not very serious errors of transmission. They should not be held much against Symeon's narrative, and still less against the sequence of events he gives as far as 829.

After 829 the character of the Logothete's *Chronicle* changes. For one thing, it becomes considerably more extensive, including more numerous and more detailed entries, some of which mention fairly trivial events. The sixteen years from 813 to 829 take up about a third as much space in the full text of Symeon's *Chronicle* as the sixteen years from 829 to 845; the former period is represented by twenty main and subordinate entries and the latter by fifty-two.<sup>56</sup> If the part of the *Chronicle* after 829 is chronologically accurate, the fact is of great importance, because until now our chronology of this period has been largely a matter of conjectures on which scholars do not agree. By the same token, for these years Symeon's chronology is difficult to check. But if, amid such an abundance of specific information, none of his relative dates can be proved wrong and all his relative dates can be shown to be plausible, this is the most we can expect of him. This I hope to demonstrate, according to the following table.

TABLE II

(“Leo Grammaticus,” Bonn ed., 213.7–229.18, supplemented  
by “Georgius Monachus [Interpolatus],” Bonn ed. [hereafter GMI])<sup>57</sup>

## REIGN OF THEOPHILUS

213.8: Theophilus reigned twelve years.

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. 213.8–214.6: Theophilus marries Theodora.   | June 5, 830        |
| 2. 214.6–8: Euphrosyne retires to convent.   | June 830           |
| 3. 214.9–215.3: Theophilus executes murderers of Leo V.                                | summer 830         |
| 4. 215.3–5 (suppl. from GMI, 791.16–20): Theophilus begins persecution of iconophiles. | late 832/early 833 |
| 5. 215.6–11: Theophobus deserts from Arabs to Byzantines.                              | beginning of 834   |

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Treadgold, “Problem,” 327 note 13, though now, with a better understanding of Symeon's source, I would not maintain that he “suppressed” the fact that Michael had remarried. It is enough that in his brief account he simply did not mention the fact.

<sup>56</sup> Note that to make the computation it is necessary to complete the occasional lacunas in Leo Gramm.; the proportion appears most clearly in Theod. Mel.

<sup>57</sup> Theod. Mel., 147–60; *Vat. Gr.* 1807, fols. 54r–59v; interpolated George, Bonn ed., 789–816, ed. Murlalt, 699–722 (both mixed with genuine text of George).

6. 215.12–19: Theophilus decorates palace with Pentapyrgium and *automata*. 834/36
7. 215.20–216.11: Theophilus punishes Petronas. 834/36
8. 216.12–218.7: Theophilus betroths his daughter Maria to Alexius Musele (cast forward to Alexius' expedition to Sicily [837–39], death of Maria [839], and Alexius' recall and imprisonment [839] and release [early 840?]). 836
9. 218.8–221.3: Theophilus and general Manuel take Zapetra and Samosata (cast back to Manuel's flight to Arabs [late 829/early 830], John the Grammarian's embassy [mid–830], and Manuel's return [end of 830]). March–April 837
10. 221.3–5: Theophilus orders construction of Bryas Palace. late spring 837
11. 221.5–9: Theophilus celebrates triumph. late spring 837
12. 221.10–22: Theophilus makes John the Grammarian patriarch (cast forward to John's iconoclastic measures [late spring 838] and construction of Trullus Palace [later 838?]). April 21, 838
13. 222.1–22 (suppl. from GMI, 802.7–803.16): Manuel saves Theophilus from betrayal by Khurramites [battle of Anzen] (cast forward to death of Manuel [July 27, 838], Khurramite revolt [mid-838–late 839], and birth of Michael III [January 9, 840]). July 22, 838
14. 222.23–223.22: Theophilus returns to capital and pays compensation for a misappropriated horse. late July/early August 838
15. 223.23–224.18: Caliph takes Amorium (cast back to first news of Arab expedition [April/May 838], Theophilus' advance into Cappadocia [late May 838], caliph's detachment of Afshīn [early June 838], battle of Anzen [July 22, 838], and investment of Amorium [August 1, 838]). August 12, 838
16. 224.18–225.3: Caliph returns to Syria with noble captives from Amorium (cast forward to their martyrdom [March 6, 845]). late August/September 838
17. 225.3–16: Caliph sends invitation to Leo the Mathematician (cast forward to Leo's teaching at Magnaura [late 838–early 840]). fall 838

- and appointment as metropolitan of Thessalonica [spring 840]).
18. 225.17–23: Theophilus builds Triconch, Sigma, Court of Phiale, and Mysterium. late 838/early 839
  19. 226.1–227.2 (suppl. from GMI, 806.22–808.11): Theophilus brands SS. Theophanes and Theodore (cast forward to death of Theodore [December 28, 840], and appointment of Theophanes as metropolitan of Nicaea [843]). July 18, 839
  20. 227.3–11: Helmet of statue of Justinian in Augustaeum falls and is replaced. late 839/early 840
  21. 227.12–13: Theophilus crowns Michael III. (May 16?) 840
  22. 227.13–14 (suppl. from GMI, 809.5–21): Theophilus founds Hospice of Theophilus. late 840/41
  23. 227.14–228.8: Theophilus dies after executing Theophobus. January 20, 842

## REIGN OF MICHAEL III

[Length of reign not given in original source.]

1. 228.12–20: Theodora deposes Patriarch John and chooses Methodius as patriarch. March 4, 843
2. 228.20–229.1: Theodora restores icons. March 11, 843
3. 229.1–9 (suppl. from GMI, 814.14–815.5): Theoctistus makes an expedition against Crete but is tricked into returning. March 18-later 843
4. 229.9–18 (suppl. from GMI, 815.5–16): Arabs defeat Theoctistus at Mauropotamum, and Theophanes Pharganus deserts to Arabs (cast forward to Theophanes' return [before 855]). mid-843/44
5. (suppl. from GMI, 815.16–21): Theoctistus forces Bardas into exile. mid-843/44
6. (suppl. from GMI, 815.22–816.4): Theoctistus builds himself a palace in Apsis. ca. 844

Passing over the length of Theophilus' reign, which is rounded to the nearest year (the exact length was twelve years, three months, and eighteen days), we arrive at the entry which has long been the greatest obstacle to accepting Symeon's chronology: his description of Theophilus' marriage. I have argued at length elsewhere that Symeon's clearly implied date of Pentecost (June 5) 830 deserves acceptance on every ground, while the widely accepted modern date of Pentecost 821 is indefensible.<sup>58</sup>

A brief recapitulation of my arguments will suffice here. The only evidence against the date of 830 is the report that Theophilus' daughter Maria was

<sup>58</sup> See Treadgold, "Problem," 325–41.

married during his reign, which suggests that she was grown. But the list of imperial tombs in the *De caerimoniis* calls Maria's tomb a λαρνάκιον, a diminutive that is used only for the tombs of children. Therefore Maria died a child, and was either married as a child or only betrothed. The only reason for connecting Theophilus' marriage with his coronation in 821 is a phrase that is not in Leo the Grammarian's version of Symeon or in the Pseudo-Symeon but is in the other published versions, which implies that both Theodora and Theophilus were crowned with the crowns of both marriage and empire when they were married. This phrase should be rejected, because the Logothete has already described Theophilus' coronation (without the marriage) in its proper place in 821. Further, Symeon's description of the marriage is in accord with imperial protocol if placed in 830 but violates it in three ways if placed in 821. Besides, in 821 the bridegroom would have been eight years old and the Triclinium of the Pearl, where his bride-show was held, would not have existed; it was built in Theophilus' own reign, presumably in late 829 or early 830, for the occasion. The case in favor of the Logothete's date for Theophilus' marriage, which also makes better historical sense and agrees with the numismatic evidence, is simply overwhelming.

The Logothete makes a connection between Theophilus' marriage and the retirement of the Empress Euphrosyne, who had been her stepson's coregent and had held his bride-show. Euphrosyne's deference to Theophilus presents a strong contrast to the ambition of such maternal coregents as Irene and Theodora. Her ruling had been her husband's idea: Theophanes Continuatus records that Michael had made the senate take an oath at the time of his remarriage that they would recognize her as coregent if he died before her.<sup>59</sup> Still, she was apparently content to have her portrait left off the coinage, unless it is simply that no coins from the time of her nine-month coregency have been found. Probably she had planned all along to retire as soon as she had married off Theophilus, which she did by sending to all the themes of the Empire for suitable candidates, a process that she must have begun months earlier. Her retirement, and the beginning of the reign of Theophilus alone, is thus to be dated to June 830.

Next the Logothete gives an account of Theophilus' execution of the murderers of Leo V, who happened to have been the partisans of his own father, Michael II. Theophanes Continuatus refers to this execution and to Theophilus' sending Euphrosyne to her convent as the "first acts" of Theophilus' reign.<sup>60</sup> Though modern scholars have rejected the Continuer's implication that Euphrosyne's retirement was not voluntary, his date for these events can be reconciled with the Logothete's if we assume that by Theophilus' reign the Continuer means his reign by himself, beginning in June 830.<sup>61</sup> He would accordingly have had the conspirators executed in the summer of 830, and this would make good sense. He would have found it awkward if not impossible

<sup>59</sup> Theoph. Cont., 78.

<sup>60</sup> Καὶ τὰ πρῶτα μὲν τούτου (i.e., Theophilus) τοιαῦτα. Theoph. Cont., 86.

<sup>61</sup> On Euphrosyne's retirement, see Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 125–26.

to take this step, which reflected badly on his father, while Michael's widow was still his coregent; we have no reason to think that Euphrosyne shared her stepson's ruthlessly impartial ideas of justice.

Symeon declares that the real reason Theophilus had the conspirators executed was that in Leo they had killed an ardent iconoclast. This leads the Logothete into his next entry, Theophilus' destruction of icons and exiling and torturing of iconophile monks. Here Symeon must be referring to Theophilus' edict against the iconophiles at the end of 832 or the beginning of 833.<sup>62</sup> Again, it is worth observing that Theophilus did not begin persecuting iconophiles until the retirement of Euphrosyne, who was an iconophile herself.<sup>63</sup>

The next entry in Symeon's *Chronicle* is the desertion of Theophobus the "Persian" from the Arabs to the Byzantines with a band of a thousand "Persians." Grégoire has shown that "Theophobus" was the name taken by the Khurramite Naṣr after his desertion with his Khurramite followers, whom the Byzantines called "Persians." Naṣr's flight can be securely dated to the beginning of 834 on the basis of Arab sources.<sup>64</sup> After this fixed point, the Logothete mentions Theophilus' redecoration of the Great Palace with gold furnishings. These were a display case for imperial insignia in the form of a little five-towered building called the Pentapyrgium, two huge organs of solid gold decorated with precious stones, and a golden tree on which mechanical birds sat and sang.<sup>65</sup> Symeon also mentions here Theophilus' addition to the imperial wardrobe of robes woven of golden thread. The only means of dating this entry appears to be the statement in the *Chronicle* that the master goldsmith commissioned to make all these articles was a relative of the Patriarch Antonius. This implies that Antonius was still alive when the work was done, which, as we shall see, means a date before April 838.<sup>66</sup> The following entry relates how the emperor had his brother-in-law Petronas, Drungary of the Watch, whipped for building a palace that cut off the light from the house of a widow. The incident itself is not independently datable, but Petronas was not both Theophilus' brother-in-law and Drungary of the Watch before June 830, when Theophilus married, or as late as 838, when Constantine Babutzicus was drungary.<sup>67</sup> We therefore have no reason to object to the Logothete's order so far.

This brings us to a long and complex entry that begins with Theophilus' betrothal (or marriage) of his daughter Maria to Alexius Musele, an event that serves as the reference point for a long cast forward. I have argued elsewhere

<sup>62</sup> See D. Papachryssanthou, "Un Confesseur du second iconoclasme: La Vie du Patrice Nicéas," *TM*, 3 (1968), 320–21. However, Euthymius of Sardis, an iconophile, died on December 26, 831, after being tortured; see J. Gouillard, "Un Oeuvre inédit du Patriarche Méthode," *BZ*, 53 (1960), 40–41, which should have been cited in Treadgold, "Problem," 336 note 47.

<sup>63</sup> On Euphrosyne's iconophilism, see Treadgold, *ibid.*, 338–40.

<sup>64</sup> See Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 124 and note 3.

<sup>65</sup> On the Pentapyrgium and the tree, see A. Grabar, *L'Iconoclasme byzantin: Dossier archéologique* (Paris, 1957), 170; on the organs, see E. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1961), 106–7; see also Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 133–34.

<sup>66</sup> See *infra*, pp. 178–80.

<sup>67</sup> See Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 147 note 1, who notes that Aëtius, later strategus of the Anatolic Theme, may have been Constantine's predecessor. This would probably mean that Petronas was no longer drungary by 837.

that Maria, who was a mere infant at the time, was probably only engaged to Alexius, though the Logothete and Theophanes Continuatus assumed when they wrote more than a century later that her betrothal had soon been followed by marriage.<sup>68</sup> The Logothete and the Continuer give narratives of the career of Alexius that conflict on several points. Bury, Vasiliev, Dvornik, and Grégoire, relying variously on evidence from Arab sources, the *De caerimoniis*, the *Life of Gregory the Decapolite*, and an inscription, have all concluded that Symeon's account is the more reliable; particularly, they accepted the Logothete's statement that Theophilus sent Alexius with an army to Sicily, not, as the Continuer states, to "Lombardy," meaning the Lombard Principality of Benevento in South Italy.<sup>69</sup>

Alexius' betrothal to Maria could not have occurred before 835, because Maria was Theophilus' fifth child and could scarcely have been born before then, and because the betrothal took place only after the death of the emperor's fourth child Constantine, who lived long enough to be crowned and to appear on the coinage. On the other hand, Alexius was given the rank of caesar after his betrothal, and as such participated in Theophilus' triumphal procession in the late spring of 837.<sup>70</sup> The date of 836 for the "marriage" that was first proposed by Bury therefore seems highly probable. Then, according to the reconstructions of the scholars mentioned above, Alexius left for the West in time to put down a rebellion and to be commemorated in an inscription in Macedonia before arriving in Sicily to defeat the Arabs in engagements dated by Arab sources to early 838. According to the same reconstructions, Alexius was recalled to Constantinople in 839 after the death of Maria, which probably occurred earlier in the same year. Upon his arrival in the capital, Alexius was imprisoned on suspicion of having plotted against Theophilus. Although Symeon does not give us precise information about the time Theophilus released Alexius, it may well have been in early 840 after the birth of Michael III, when the Continuer says that Alexius retired to a monastery.<sup>71</sup> The Logothete's whole story is plainly a cast forward from the betrothal in 836. Thus, if the Logothete is reliable, Theophilus had his golden decorations made and had Petronas punished between 834 and 836, years which are compatible with the other evidence.

The first sentence in the next entry in the Logothete's *Chronicle* simply records that Manuel was the most famous of Theophilus' generals in the East, presumably making a comparison with Alexius in the West. The entry then tells how Manuel deserted to the Arabs in fear when a courtier falsely alleged that Manuel was plotting to make himself emperor. Greatly distressed by this desertion, Theophilus sent John the Grammarian on an embassy to the caliph, with orders to make secret proposals to Manuel for his return. Manuel agreed and, leading an Arab army into the Anatolic Theme, deserted back to Theo-

<sup>68</sup> Treadgold, "Problem," 330–31.

<sup>69</sup> For the references, see *ibid.*, 331–32.

<sup>70</sup> On the chronology of Theophilus' children, see *ibid.*, 333–35; on the date of the triumph, see *infra*, p. 178.

<sup>71</sup> Theoph. Cont., 108–9; for all of Alexius' career, see Treadgold, "Problem," 329–32.

philus with it, having first dismissed the caliph's son, who was with him. Although Brooks and Grégoire believed that Manuel deserted under Michael II, not Theophilus, as is said in an account that Theophanes Continuatus mentions and rejects, all other accounts support the Logothete, including the account accepted by the Continuer and those of Genesius and Michael the Syrian. As John Rosser has recently pointed out, such a rejection of all our sources presents no advantages and causes several problems.<sup>72</sup> In particular, if Manuel did not flee under Theophilus, Michael the Syrian, following Dionysius of Tellmahṛē, would have had to make the same mistake as the Greek chroniclers, though before 842 he is consistently independent of them (and usually also of the truth). Here, on a subject that his Arab informants had reason to know about, Dionysius apparently got his story right.<sup>73</sup>

The late ninth-century Arab chronicler Ibn Ṭayfūr, supported by other Arabic sources, records that Manuel fled to Theophilus from the area of Coron (near the Anatolic Theme) after parting from the caliph's son Al-'Abbās in Ramadan of 215 A.H., which lasted from October 22 to November 20, 830.<sup>74</sup> To allow time for the intervening events, Manuel must have gone over to the Arabs early in 830, if not late in 829. John the Grammarian's embassy would have taken place sometime in the middle of 830. These dates agree with those of Michael the Syrian if we follow Bury's assumption that Michael (or Dionysius) mistakenly added an extra year at the beginning of Theophilus' reign.<sup>75</sup> But not even the latest of these events, the return of Manuel at the end of 830, could be the Logothete's reference point here if he is accurate, because his previous entry dates from 836.

The solution to this apparent difficulty is that Symeon's reference point is the event he mentions next, the successful campaign of Theophilus and Manuel against Zapetra and Samosata, dated by Arab sources to March and April of 837.<sup>76</sup> Before telling the story of the sack of these two cities, the Logothete's *Chronicle* casts back to tell the story of Manuel's earlier adventures under Theophilus. Thus, we find events that occurred in the early spring of 837 following an event that took place in 836, and the Logothete's chronology remains sound. The method adopted in this entry for casts back—giving the cast back first and then proceeding to the reference point—is the customary one in chronicles, as Jenkins noted;<sup>77</sup> the author of chronicle A was exceptional in that he obligingly signaled his casts back by mentioning his reference point at the beginning of his entry.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>72</sup> "John the Grammarian's Embassy to Baghdad and the Recall of Manuel," *Byzantinoslavica*, 37 (1976), 168–71.

<sup>73</sup> On Dionysius' reliability, see *supra*, pp. 161–62.

<sup>74</sup> See Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 98–103 and esp. 392, where Ibn Ṭayfūr is translated.

<sup>75</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 472 note 1. With this correction, Michael (trans. Chabot, 74) dates Manuel's flight to 1141 of the Seleucid Era (October 1, 829–September 30, 830) and his return to 1142 (October 1, 830–September 30, 831). My dates agree with those of Rosser, *op. cit.*, though I am skeptical about his assumption that there was time for another embassy of John to Baghdad before Manuel's flight, and am inclined to believe that in fact John undertook only one embassy, the one in 830.

<sup>76</sup> See M. Rekaya, "Mise au point sur Théophobe et l'alliance de Bâbak avec Théophile," *Byzantion*, 44 (1974), 55–57.

<sup>77</sup> Jenkins, *op. cit.* (note 5 *supra*), 92.

<sup>78</sup> In entry 4 under Leo's reign and entry 4 under Michael II's (see Table 1).



Symeon now records two events that immediately followed the campaign of the emperor and Manuel: Theophilus' arrival at Bryas in Bithynia, where he ordered a palace with gardens to be built, and his arrival in Constantinople, where he celebrated the triumph that has already been mentioned.<sup>79</sup> These events are to be dated to the late spring of 837, as Theophilus marched back from Cilicia. Theophanes Continuatus says that John the Grammarian persuaded Theophilus to build the palace at Bryas on the plan of Arab palaces that John had seen while on an embassy to Baghdad, and that John took charge of the work, for which he was rewarded with the rank of patrician.<sup>80</sup> If the Continuer is right, John had already gone on his embassy to Baghdad at this time, probably seven years earlier, and evidently was not yet patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>81</sup>

As it happens, the next entry in Symeon's *Chronicle* is the death of the Patriarch Antonius and Theophilus' appointment of John the Grammarian to the patriarchate. Theophanes Continuatus reports that John was installed as patriarch on Sunday, April 21, though he does not say of which year.<sup>82</sup> April 21 fell on a Sunday twice in Theophilus' reign, in 832 and 838. As Venance Grumel pointed out, the original version of the letter of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to Theophilus, dated to April 836, refers to the Patriarch Antonius as still living.<sup>83</sup> Therefore, it would seem that John became patriarch on April 21, 838, the Sunday after Easter. If so, John would still have been a layman when he was supervising the construction of the Bryas Palace in the late spring of 837; and Symeon's order would be correct here, because in his *Chronicle* John's accession follows Theophilus' triumph in 837 and precedes the battle of Anzen on July 22, 838.

Nevertheless, Grumel adopted the date of January 21, 837 for John's accession, a date which has been followed by most later scholars. Grumel relied on a list of patriarchs of Constantinople in the *Chronographia* of Theophanes. Though the mention of John's patriarchate is obviously not the work of Theophanes, who died in 818, Grumel dated it to the patriarchate of John's successor Methodius (843–47) because John is the last patriarch it lists. The list, according to the majority of the manuscripts of Theophanes, gives John a patriarchate of five years and one month, which, since Methodius was elected to replace him on March 4, 843, would put his accession in early February or late January of 837. Grumel accordingly emended the text of Theophanes Continuatus to read Ἰανουαρίου instead of Ἀπριλλίου, observing that the two words have five letters in common and that January 21, 837, was in fact a Sunday. Finally, Grumel noted that the Pseudo-Symeon dates John's accession to the eighth year of Theophilus, 836/37.<sup>84</sup>

This last argument is worthless, because the Pseudo-Symeon's date is simply

<sup>79</sup> See *supra*, p. 176.

<sup>80</sup> Theoph. Cont., 98.

<sup>81</sup> On the time of his embassy, see *supra*, note 75.

<sup>82</sup> Theoph. Cont., 121.

<sup>83</sup> "Chronologie des patriarches iconoclastes du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle," *EO*, 34 (1935), 164 and note 1.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 163–66; the interpolated catalogue of patriarchs occurs in Theophanes, 362.

the result of his happening to insert here the eighth of the numbers of regnal years that he scattered at random over Symeon's original account of Theophilus.<sup>85</sup> Grumel's emendation of Theophanes Continuatus is paleographically improbable, and the unpublished edition of the Continuer by Carl de Boor, based on a better manuscript than the Bonn edition used by Grumel, retains the reading Ἀπριλλίου.<sup>86</sup> Further, if de Boor's stemma of the manuscripts of Theophanes is correct, the part of the list of patriarchs cited by Grumel does not date from the patriarchate of Methodius but is later than the late ninth century. This was the time Anastasius Bibliothecarius translated into Latin a manuscript that was earlier and better than all our surviving Greek manuscripts of this part of Theophanes. In Anastasius' version the list ends with the Patriarch Tarasius (784–806), and it could thus have been the work of Theophanes himself.<sup>87</sup> Consequently, there is no particular reason to give the addition to the list more authority than other catalogues of patriarchs that make John's patriarchate eight or nine years.<sup>88</sup> Theophanes Continuatus is certainly preferable. If anything is to be emended, it is the addition to Theophanes' list, which in some manuscripts reads ἔτη 5' καὶ μῆνας (sic) α' for John's patriarchate. If this is emended to ἔτη 6' καὶ μῆνας <1>α', it puts John's accession in April 838. In any case, there is every reason to believe that John became patriarch on April 21, 838, and that the Logothete has recorded his accession in its proper place.

In what is presumably a cast forward from John's accession, Symeon goes on to say that John, who was a conjurer, "being found a suitable instrument for the emperor's impiety and inclination, worked with him on all his projects of destruction, and caused to break forth and to be born the basilisk of impiety which the emperor had been in labor to bear but had held back, commanding the holy icons to be plastered over or effaced."<sup>89</sup> Evidently John's patriarchate brought an intensification of iconoclast measures. Symeon's statement rather resembles one in the *Synodicon Vetus*, to the effect that Theophilus, "when Antonius died, having chosen the conjurer John as patriarch, rekindled the persecution of the pious more greatly, and, having convened a godless synod in the Blachernae, anathematized those who venerated the sacred icons."<sup>90</sup> V. Grumel dated this synod shortly after John's accession (in 837, which we may correct to 838), but noted that in the absence of contemporary attesta-

<sup>85</sup> See supra, p. 160 and note 5.

<sup>86</sup> I have gained access to this edition through Professor Ihor Ševčenko, who is preparing it for publication.

<sup>87</sup> See de Boor's edition of Theophanes, II, 230, for Anastasius' text, and *ibid.*, 550, for the stemma (MSS a and b are missing this part of Theophanes' text).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 428–29.

<sup>89</sup> ὅς ὄργανον ἐπιτήδειον εὐρεθείς τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ἀσεβείας τε καὶ ῥοπῆς, αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ πρὸς ἀπώλειαν συνειργάσατο, καὶ ὃν ὥδινε μὲν κατεῖχε δὲ βασιλίσκον τῆς ἀσεβείας ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἐξέρρηξεν καὶ ἀπέτεκεν, τὰς ἀγίας εἰκόνας ἀναχρίσθαι προστάξας ἢ ἀπαλείφεισθαι: Leo Gramm., 221.13–17.

<sup>90</sup> . . . τελευτήσαντος Ἀντωνίου, τὸν λεκανομάντιν πρόεδρον Ἰωάννην προχειρισάμενος, μειλόνως τοῖς εὐσεβέσι τὸν διωγμὸν ἀνερρίπισε, καὶ ἄθεον ἐν Βλαχέρναις κατασκευάσας συνέδριον, τοὺς προσκυνητὰς τῶν σεβασμίων εἰκόνων ἀνεθεμάτισε: J. Fabricius and G. Harles, eds., *Bibliotheca Graeca*, XII (Hamburg, 1809), 416. I have learned from Professor John Duffy, whose new edition of the *Synodicon* is forthcoming (DOT, V), that the text of Fabricius and Harles is correct here, though he is "very skeptical about pieces of information not attested in any other source" than the *Synodicon*.

tions its existence was somewhat suspect.<sup>91</sup> Though the Logothete does not mention a synod as such, he makes it plain that stronger measures were taken against iconophilism shortly after John became patriarch, and this tends to make the synod seem more likely.

Presumably continuing his cast forward from John's accession, Symeon now mentions the Trullus Palace, which John had built for himself and used for conjuring. The Logothete adds that the palace is still called Trullus and remains uninhabited because of the demons that had been there. Theophanes Continuatus has more to say about this palace, agreeing with Symeon that it was built after John's accession. The Continuer records that it was purchased from John's brother Arsaber by Basil the Macedonian when Basil was Paracoemomenus and converted by him into a monastery dedicated to St. Phocas.<sup>92</sup> According to C. Mango, Basil was Paracoemomenus only from 865 to 866.<sup>93</sup> It is plain, therefore, that when the Logothete says that the palace was still called Trullus and still uninhabited, he is not speaking of his own times but is copying his source. Consequently, his source seems to have been written between 843, when John was relegated to the Monastery of Clidium, and 865/66.<sup>94</sup> Though the time the Trullus Palace was built is not specifically recorded, Symeon appears to put it soon after John became patriarch, and the Continuer mentions so much that went on there during Theophilus' reign that it cannot have been built much after 838.

The next entry is the most controversial in the whole portion of the Logothete's *Chronicle* that we are studying, but at least the date of its main event is certain. This is a disastrous defeat by the Arabs from which Theophilus barely escaped with his life; from the Arab sources, and from Genesius and the Continuer, it is clear that this was the battle of Anzen (or Dazimon) on July 22, 838.<sup>95</sup> The problems that surround the battle of Anzen concern the actions of Theophilus' two generals, Manuel and Theophobus, who all medieval and modern authorities agree were present at the battle. According to Symeon, Theophilus was worsted in an engagement with the Arabs and took refuge with a company of Theophobus' Khurramites, among whom Manuel also found himself. Discovering that the Khurramites intended to betray the emperor to the Arabs in order to save themselves, Manuel grasped the bridle of the emperor's horse and began to lead him away. Though Theophilus did not understand what was happening and resisted, Manuel barely managed to lead him to safety by threatening him with his sword. The emperor then made his way to Dorylaeum.

<sup>91</sup> *Les Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I, 2 (Chalcedon, 1936), 42, no. 413.

<sup>92</sup> Theoph. Cont., 156–57, cf. 155. The Continuer says that the palace was built for John by Arsaber, but this should no doubt be considered a completion rather than a contradiction of Symeon. On the monastery, see R. Janin, *Le Siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique: Les Eglises et les monastères*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1969), 498–99.

<sup>93</sup> "Eudocia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty," *ZVI*, 14–15 (1973), 22–24.

<sup>94</sup> Janin, *op. cit.*, 280–81; cf. *infra*, p. 193.

<sup>95</sup> Though I have considered the intensified persecution of iconophiles and the beginning of the construction of the Trullus Palace as entries in a cast forward from John's accession, it is possible that both occurred during the three months after John became patriarch and could thus be classed as main entries.

Although the other accounts of this incident are extremely confused, all of them are generally compatible with what the Logothete says, and most explicitly confirm it. As Henri Grégoire has pointed out, Genesius gives two accounts of the incident and the Continuer three, in each case as if it were a separate occurrence. Genesius first mentions an incident that supposedly occurred before Manuel's flight to the Arabs, in which Manuel saved Theophilus from the Arabs by seizing his bridle and threatening him with his sword, though why Theophilus should not have wanted to be saved from the Arabs is not clear.<sup>96</sup> Then Genesius tells the same story as Symeon about the battle of Anzen, in which Manuel saved Theophilus from being betrayed to the Arabs by the Khurramites.<sup>97</sup> The Continuer (who, we should remember, used both Genesius and some of Genesius' sources) recounts both these stories, the one before Manuel's flight and the one at Anzen.<sup>98</sup> And before recounting either he gives another account, which from several details can easily be identified with the battle of Anzen. According to it, the emperor, having found himself among Theophobus and his Khurramites, some of whom wanted to betray him to the Arabs, "was saved." Though here the Continuer does not tell us by whom the emperor was saved, he then says that Theophilus was angry with the Khurramites but not with Theophobus.<sup>99</sup> Finally, one Arab source, Al-Mas'ūdī, relates that Theophilus was only saved from the Arabs at Anzen because he was protected by Theophobus and some of his Khurramites.<sup>100</sup>

In the opinion of Grégoire, Mas'ūdī's version shows that it was Theophobus, not Manuel, who saved Theophilus' life, a conclusion for which he finds support in the version of the Continuer in which the emperor "was saved" while with Theophobus and his followers. The five versions given by the Logothete, Genesius, and the Continuer in which Manuel saved Theophilus were attributed by Grégoire to the elaborations of those who revered Manuel as a saint, especially the monks of the Convent of Manuel in which he was buried. But this supposes a contradiction between the former and latter versions which does not need to be supposed. All versions agree that Theophilus found refuge from the Arabs with Theophobus' band of Khurramites. Naturally, the Arabs, who could not know what was happening behind the Byzantines' lines, knew only this. All four Byzantine accounts of the battle of Anzen (leaving out Genesius' and the Continuer's story of the battle that supposedly preceded Manuel's flight to the Arabs) agree that after Theophilus took refuge with the Khurramites some of them, among whom no source includes Theophobus, intended to betray the emperor to the Arabs. Of these versions, the Logothete, Genesius, and one of the Continuer's two versions specify that it was Manuel who took the emperor's bridle and saved him; the less precise of the Continuer's two

<sup>96</sup> Genesius, 61–62.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 68–69.

<sup>98</sup> Theoph. Cont., 116–18, 127–29.

<sup>99</sup> Theoph. Cont., 113–14. For the identification of the battle with Anzen, see Grégoire, *op. cit.* (note 4 *supra*), 189–90.

<sup>100</sup> The passage is translated in Vasiliev, *Byzance*, I, 331–32. All these passages are discussed by Grégoire, *op. cit.*, 188–91, 201–2.

versions does not say who saved Theophilus, but only that Theophobus was loyal, which no one doubts. No source gives us any reason to challenge the Logothete's story. Though Grégoire recognized that the Logothete's *Chronicle* was the best source for the period, in this case he seems to have underrated it.<sup>101</sup>

This is not, however, the end of the controversy. The Logothete now relates that Manuel died of wounds that he had received in the battle of Anzen and was buried in the Convent of Manuel, which he himself had founded. Genesisius and the Continuer flatly and consistently contradict this. According to them, in 843 Manuel was at the point of death (from what affliction we are not told) when some Studite monks promised him that he would recover if he would champion the cause of the icons, and so he did.<sup>102</sup> Manuel then went on to take the principal part in restoring the icons, soon after which he went into retirement.<sup>103</sup> Finally, he came out of retirement to fight the Arabs in another battle of Anzen, in which he saved the Emperor Michael III under circumstances suspiciously similar to those of the first battle in the same place.<sup>104</sup> This second battle could not be dated earlier than the late 850's, because Michael would not have been fighting in the manner described before his late teens. Only some time after this second battle of Anzen, according to the Continuer, did Manuel finally die.<sup>105</sup>

To support Genesisius and the Continuer against the Logothete, Bury and others have cited the report of Michael the Syrian that Manuel was commander of the Byzantine army after 842.<sup>106</sup> Here, however, Michael is following Ignatius of Melitene, who followed "Greek chronicles" about 1100.<sup>107</sup> In fact, Ignatius' version resembled the version of the Continuer so closely that it can be deduced that he used the Continuer himself or a text based on him.<sup>108</sup> No source that is likely to be independent of Genesisius and the Continuer says anything about Manuel after 838, including the fairly numerous hagiographical and documentary sources for the restoration of the icons.<sup>109</sup>

Grégoire argued at length that the common source of Genesisius and Theophanes Continuatus was an elaborately falsified *Life* of Manuel composed for the monks of the Convent of Manuel. This *Life* suppressed the fact that Manuel had died an iconoclast in 838 and added fictional exploits of his after that date, particularly his leading role in the restoration of orthodoxy and his saving the life of Michael III just as he had saved the life of Michael's father, Theo-

<sup>101</sup> Cf. H. Grégoire, "Études sur le neuvième siècle," *Byzantion*, 8 (1933), 521.

<sup>102</sup> Genesisius, 78-79; Theoph. Cont., 148-49.

<sup>103</sup> Genesisius, 79-80, 86; Theoph. Cont., 148, 168.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Genesisius, 91-93, 68-69; Theoph. Cont., 178-79, 127-29. In the first passage, Genesisius' "Daximon" and "Anzes" should be corrected to "Dazimon" and "Anzen."

<sup>105</sup> Theoph. Cont., 184; Genesisius seems not to mention Manuel's death.

<sup>106</sup> Michael the Syrian (trans. Chabot), III, 123; cf. Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 476; and C. Mango, "The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. Bryer and Herrin (note 51 *supra*), 134 and note 7.

<sup>107</sup> See *supra*, p. 162 and note 15.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Theoph. Cont., 148; and the derivative version of John Scylitzes, who wrote in the eleventh century, ed. J. Thurn (Berlin-New York, 1973), 81.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. J. Gouillard, "Le Synodicon de l'orthodoxie: Edition et commentaire," *TM*, 2 (1967), 119-29, esp. note 23.

philus.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, since the Continuer himself records that Manuel held the important post of protostrator and was a trusted adviser of Michael I in 813, he would have been rather old to be snatching Michael III from the Arabs in the late 850's.<sup>111</sup> But the best proof of Grégoire's thesis is the discovery by François Halkin that Manuel is commemorated in the *Synaxarium*, which dates from the end of the ninth century or the early tenth, under July 27.<sup>112</sup> This not only confirms Grégoire's conjecture that Manuel was venerated as a saint but confirms the Logothete's dating of Manuel's death right after the battle of Anzen on July 22, 838.<sup>113</sup> Manuel survived only five days after the battle.

Symeon does not end his cast forward with the death of Manuel and his subsequent burial in his convent. According to Symeon, soon after Anzen the Khurramites, including Theophobus, were accused of treason. Fearing Theophilus' wrath, they made their way to Sinope, where they set up Theophobus as a usurper. Having learned of this, the emperor went himself to Paphlagonia and, giving the Khurramites a pledge of immunity, returned to Constantinople with Theophobus. It was "then" that Michael III was born.<sup>114</sup> If we follow the persuasive arguments of Mango that Michael III was born on January 9, 840, Theophobus' reign at Sinope would have lasted from mid-838 to late 839, or nearly a year and a half.<sup>115</sup> Genesius and the Continuer declare that Theophilus had to send a fleet to Amastris under Ooryphas, Drungary of the Watch, before he brought the Khurramites to terms.<sup>116</sup> Land and sea expeditions large enough to overawe the formidable Khurramites would have been difficult to mount soon after the serious Byzantine defeats at Anzen and Amorium. If we combine the Continuer's account with that of the Logothete, we must conclude that Theophilus and Ooryphas set out against the rebels in 839, and that modern scholars have underestimated the revolt's duration and seriousness.<sup>117</sup> Evidently the mention of the birth of Michael at the end of the cast forward is a chronological indication, though the fact that it settled the succession to the exclusion of Theophobus was probably also in the original chronicler's mind.<sup>118</sup>

After the battle of Anzen and the cast forward from it the Logothete's next entry puts Theophilus in Constantinople, where he showed his justice by pay-

<sup>110</sup> Grégoire, "Etudes," 520-21; and *idem*, "Manuel et Théophobe," 183-204; cf. P. Karlin-Hayter, "Les Deux Histoires du règne de Michel III," *Byzantion*, 41 (1971), 460-68.

<sup>111</sup> Theoph. Cont., 18, cf. 109-10. Manuel could hardly have been born after 790, and was probably born somewhat earlier.

<sup>112</sup> "Trois dates historiques précisées grâce au synaxaire," *Byzantion*, 24 (1954), 9-11; for the date of the *Synaxarium*, see *ibid.*, 8 and note 3.

<sup>113</sup> Though the *Synaxarium* gives no year for the death, the day of the month seems to fit too well to be a coincidence.

<sup>114</sup> Note that here the versions of Leo Grammaticus and the interpolated George (Bonn ed.) must both be consulted to arrive at a complete text.

<sup>115</sup> Mango, "Michael III" (note 2 *supra*), 253-58.

<sup>116</sup> Genesius, 60-61 (cf. 57-60); Theoph. Cont., 135-36.

<sup>117</sup> The most complete and recent treatment of the revolt is by J. Rosser, "Theophilus' Khurramite Policy and its Finale: The Revolt of Theophobus' Persian Troops in 838," *Byzantina*, 6 (1974), 268-71.

<sup>118</sup> The nature of the entry was recognized by Mango, "Michael III," 257, where he left open the question of when Theophobus returned to Constantinople, and thus when the Logothete dates Michael's birth.

ing compensation to a man whose horse had been misappropriated by the count of the Opsician Theme for the emperor's own use. Here the Logothete lends support to the report of Michael the Syrian that Theophilus returned to Constantinople immediately after the battle of Anzen to refute rumors that he had been killed in the battle.<sup>119</sup> Although Michael is wrong about many of the events of this period, his report fits well with the other sources in explaining why Theophilus interrupted his military operations when his presence was most needed to save Amorium.<sup>120</sup> It is worth noting that in the story Theophilus tells the count of the Opsician to test the horse's owner in battle, because the emperor himself now went to the Opsician Theme to continue the campaign.<sup>121</sup> The anecdote seems to show that Theophilus did not neglect justice in small matters even in the midst of great disasters.

Now Symeon introduces an entry covering six events: the arrival of the news that the caliph was marching on Amorium, Theophilus' advance into Cappadocia to meet him, the caliph's detachment of an army under "Sudeë" to meet Theophilus, "Sudeë's" defeat of the emperor, who barely escaped with his life, the caliph's investment of Amorium, and the caliph's capture of the city, which was foretold to him by one of the besieged who was a student of Leo the Mathematician. These events can be dated from the Arab sources. Since the Caliph Al-Mu'taṣim left Samarra on April 5, 838, the news of his departure would have reached Theophilus by May.<sup>122</sup> Mu'taṣim detached a force under his general Al-Afshīn, who must be identified with "Sudeë," in early June; the emperor, who was already in Cappadocia by that time, had probably arrived in late May.<sup>123</sup> Afshīn defeated Theophilus at the battle of Anzen on July 22. Mu'taṣim invested Amorium on August 1 and captured it on August 12.<sup>124</sup> All this is in chronological order—but it repeats the battle of Anzen from two entries before. To explain this, Mango suggested "that the Logothete was using two sources which he reproduced side by side without realizing that they referred to the same set of events, viz. the war of 838: hence the duplication of

<sup>119</sup> Michael the Syrian, 95. Michael says that Theophilus was recalled by a message from his "mother," but his mother, Thecla, was dead and his stepmother, Euphrosyne, had retired to a convent; though she could have sent a message from there, it is also possible that Michael is confused about who sent the message.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Vasiliev, *Byzance*, I, 158. But I am not sure that Michael the Syrian's report should be connected with the proclamation of Theophobus, as Vasiliev (*ibid.*, 158–59) and Rosser ("Policy," 269–70) would do. Michael says only that the officials were about to proclaim another emperor. If they simply believed the rumors of refugees that Theophilus had died, Alexius Musele, then in Sicily and next year recalled on suspicion of treason, was the heir and should have been proclaimed. In any case, the Khurramites' plot to betray Theophilus at Anzen was reason enough for him to be suspicious of Theophobus.

<sup>121</sup> Theophilus was in the area of Nicaea and Dorylaeum in the Opsician Theme when Amorium fell (Genesius, 69). Note that a similar anecdote about a misappropriated horse appears in Theoph. Cont., 92–94.

<sup>122</sup> Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 145 and note 3.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 148–49 (cf. 295); Afshīn entered the Empire shortly before Al-Ashinās, who entered on June 19. Whether Symeon's Σουδεῖ (Leo Gramm. has Σουδεῖ; *Vat. Gr.* 1807 has Σουδεῖ ἡ; Pseudo-Symeon, Bonn ed. [1838] as "Symeon Magister" with Theoph. Cont., 638, has Γουνδεῖ) is meant to be Afshīn's name or a title is not clear to me.

<sup>124</sup> Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 161 and note 3, 170 and note 3.

the battle of Dazimon [Anzen]."<sup>125</sup> If this suggestion is correct, the Logothete's chronology cannot have the kind of authority I have proposed for it, and his apparent accuracy after 829 is the result of a series of coincidences.

According to the *Chronicle's* chronological scheme, however, none of these main or subordinate entries is out of place. The present entry's reference point is plainly the sack of Amorium, which followed Theophilus' appearance in the capital, which in turn followed the battle of Anzen. In the first instance the battle of Anzen is mentioned in its own right, without any mention of its more serious consequence at Amorium, and used as the beginning of the story of the Khurramite revolt. When the battle of Anzen is mentioned again, it is only in one sentence in a cast back, to complete the background to the sack of Amorium. The problem seems to have been that so many interconnected events were happening at the same time in 838 that the Logothete's source was forced to group them in an unintentionally misleading way. First, he tried to show how the attempted treachery of some of the Khurramites at Anzen had led to suspicion against them and to their long and serious revolt. Then he wanted to work into his narrative an anecdote about Theophilus' justice that occurred at about the time the revolt began but was quite unrelated to it. Third, he wanted to give a connected account of the campaign of the caliph that led up to the sack of Amorium, the event that provides the background for the *Chronicle's* next two entries, on the martyrs of Amorium and Leo the Mathematician. Admittedly, the *Chronicle* as we have it is confused. But the *Chronicle* as we have it is by Symeon, who wrote more than a century later and evidently did not himself realize what his source was doing. Though we may regard the chronological scheme of his source as an awkward one, in view of the complexity of the events it is excusable, and it is certainly not inaccurate.

After the sack of Amorium, as the next entry says, Mu'taṣim returned to Syria, taking with him a group of noble prisoners. The Logothete gives the names of all six whose names we know, though he turns them into seven by counting the first and last names of one prisoner as two different people.<sup>126</sup> The prisoners, Symeon records, having been given by the caliph the choice of conversion to Islam or death, chose a glorious martyrdom. This is true, but the choice was given by the next Caliph Al-Wāthiq and their martyrdom took place seven years later on March 6, 845. Symeon, however, implies that the caliph (never named) was the same who took Amorium, and that he put the martyrs to death soon after the siege. Here, as in the previous entry, Symeon has misunderstood his source, both in misreading the names of the martyrs and in mistaking a cast forward seven years ahead for a contemporaneous event. Note that we now have a terminus post quem of 845 for the Logothete's source.

Next the *Chronicle* takes up the story of the student of Leo the Mathematician who the entry on the fall of Amorium says had confidentially foretold the fall to the caliph by means of astrology. Symeon does not mention the name

<sup>125</sup> Mango, "Michael III," 257.

<sup>126</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 271 note 3.



of the student, who in his version is not the same as Boïditzes, the traitor who betrayed the city.<sup>127</sup> When he was asked by the caliph about his knowledge, the student replied that he had been taught by Leo. His interest aroused, the caliph sent one of the Amorian prisoners to Leo in Constantinople with a letter of invitation to the Abbasid court, promising him a distinguished position there. When he received the letter, Leo was afraid that Theophilus might consider correspondence with the caliph treasonous, and accordingly brought it to the emperor's attention. Theophilus, much impressed by Leo's international reputation, set Leo up in a school in the Magnaura Palace. Leo also became metropolitan of Thessalonica. Aside from the student's making his prediction on the basis of astrology, which we do not have to take seriously, there is nothing incredible in this.

Theophanes Continuatus gives a different and longer account of the same events. The Continuer writes that a student of Leo's was captured by the Arabs ("I do not know how"), impressed the Caliph Al-Ma'mūn by his knowledge, and was sent by Ma'mūn to Constantinople with a letter inviting Leo to his court. Leo, who was then impoverished and obscure, brought the letter to the attention of Theophilus, who established Leo in a school at the church of the Forty Martyrs with a high salary. When Ma'mūn learned that Leo had refused his offer, he sent him another letter, consulting him about various geometrical and astrological questions. After Leo had answered these brilliantly in a reply, Ma'mūn offered Theophilus twenty gold centenaria and a perpetual peace if only the emperor would send him Leo for a short time. All this made Theophilus honor Leo all the more, so that he had him consecrated metropolitan of Thessalonica by the Patriarch John the Grammarian, a relative of Leo's.<sup>128</sup> However, according to the Continuer himself, Leo was consecrated in the spring of 840—yet Ma'mūn died in 833.<sup>129</sup> Despite this difficulty, Lemerle found the Continuer's version more plausible than the Logothete's, primarily because it left much more time for Leo to teach, and proposed that the Continuer was only mistaken about the connection between Ma'mūn's final letter and Leo's appointment to the see of Thessalonica.<sup>130</sup> This would mean that the Logothete has made a glaring chronological error, dating the caliph's invitation to late 838 when it actually occurred about 830.

But if the Continuer is corrected in another way, his story becomes chronologically compatible with the Logothete's. We must simply assume that the Continuer or his source confused Ma'mūn with his successor Mu'taṣim, who reigned eight years to Ma'mūn's twenty and was consequently less well known. Then we can date the capture of Leo's student, about which the Continuer

<sup>127</sup> A traitor would not have needed astrology to predict his own treason, but Ps.-Sym., 637–39, identifies the student with Boïditzes; he also places the whole subsequent story seven years in advance, so that Leo the Mathematician is consecrated by the then Patriarch Methodius. Evidently, Pseudo-Symeon knew that the Amorian martyrs had died seven years after their capture, though his year for the sack of Amorium, 839/40, is wrong as usual.

<sup>128</sup> Theoph. Cont., 186–91.

<sup>129</sup> Theoph. Cont., 192, note that Leo was deposed at the time of the restoration of the icons in the spring of 843, after having been bishop for three years.

<sup>130</sup> P. Lemerle, *Le Premier Humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 150–54.

professes ignorance, to the time of the fall of Amorium, leaving something over a year for the caliph's three letters before Leo was consecrated in the spring of 840. This puts the caliph's offer of peace in the context of the negotiations after Amorium. Since both our Byzantine sources agree that Leo taught for a relatively short time before becoming a bishop, it is hard to see why we should object to this conclusion. But there is really no other objection to the Logothete's chronology, because Greek sources are notoriously bad at Arab names and the Continuer in particular shows no sign of knowing Mu'taṣim's name at all.

If we accept the Logothete's story, an important conclusion follows. The Logothete's statement that Theophilus established Leo in a school in the Magnaura means not that the Logothete confused Theophilus' foundation with the later one of Bardas, but that Theophilus began the school in the Magnaura in 838 and Bardas returned Leo to it in 843 after three years' absence.<sup>131</sup> Therefore, even if the school lapsed entirely in Leo's absence, which was not necessarily the case, Theophilus was its original founder, and Bardas only reestablished it, apparently on a larger scale. As for Theophanes Continuatus' statement that Leo taught under Theophilus in the church of the Forty Martyrs, such a church is known to have existed within the palace enclosure and in the general area of the Magnaura, though the topographical specifics are obscure.<sup>132</sup> If the Continuer and the Logothete really do contradict each other here, the Logothete is to be preferred. It was certainly Theophilus, not Bardas, who established the first public school of the Byzantine revival of learning; that school was probably located in the Magnaura.

The Logothete's next entry records several additions made by Theophilus to the Great Palace: the Triconch, the Sigma, the Court of the Phiale, and the Mysterium. These buildings formed a distinct group, but there does not seem to be any evidence for the date at which they were built aside from the order of this entry in Symeon's *Chronicle*.<sup>133</sup>

Symeon now records perhaps the most famous event in Theophilus' persecution of iconophiles: his branding of the faces of the brothers SS. Theophanes and Theodore with verses, from which they were known as the *Grapti*. Excerpts from a letter written by St. Theodore himself prove that the brothers were branded and exiled on a July 18, but do not give the year.<sup>134</sup> Beyond this, there are two traditions about the *Grapti*. In the version given by the Logothete's *Chronicle*, the brothers were branded and exiled after John the Grammarian became patriarch, and Theodore died in exile before the death of Theophilus. An early *Encomium* of Theodore by Theophanes of Caesarea and the Metaphrastic *Life* of Theodore (which is also by Symeon the Logothete

<sup>131</sup> Theoph. Cont., 192; the fact that this passage dates Bardas' establishment to 843 was practically affirmed by P. Speck, *Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel* (Munich, 1974), 4–5, and esp. 7 note 28. I believe this interpretation is as certain as interpretations of Byzantine sources can be.

<sup>132</sup> Janin, *op. cit.* (note 96 *supra*), 484, no. 4; but Janin himself is inclined to identify Leo's church with no. 3 (483–84), that in the Mese, apparently on the ground that it was better known.

<sup>133</sup> See Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 130–31.

<sup>134</sup> The letter is excerpted in the Metaphrastic *Life of St. Theodore*, PG, 116, cols. 672B–680A. On its authenticity, see Ševčenko, *op. cit.* (note 51 *supra*), 119 and note 44.

but appears to have completely independent sources) both state that John was patriarch at the time of the branding and that Theodore died in exile at Apamea in Bithynia before Theophilus died.<sup>135</sup> The *Synaxarium* and the *Menologium* of Basil II similarly record that Theodore died in exile on a December 28.<sup>136</sup> If we follow this tradition, the branding would have occurred after John became patriarch on April 21, 838—but not on July 18 of that year, because Theophilus was then on campaign, as we have seen. Since the *Encomium* mentions that Theophilus forbade people to visit Theodore's grave and the *Metaphrastic Life* says that his body remained miraculously preserved until Theophilus died, more than a month seems to have elapsed between Theodore's death and Theophilus', so that Theodore did not die on December 28, 841.<sup>137</sup> Finally, because the emperor is not likely to have had the brothers branded on a Sunday, they were probably not branded on July 18, 840. This leaves July 18, 839, as the presumptive date of the branding and December 28, 840, as that of Theodore's death, because the sources imply that his exile lasted longer than six months.

Against this is the version of the *Life of Michael Syncellus*, which dates the branding to July 18, 836. Further, it states that Theodore survived Theophilus, and that Theophanes died on October 11, 845, four years after being ordained metropolitan of Nicaea by the Patriarch Methodius.<sup>138</sup> But this cannot be, because Methodius became patriarch on March 4, 843, only two years (or, by inclusive reckoning, three years) before Theophanes supposedly died. From these and a number of other contradictory and suspiciously specific chronological data in the *Life of Michael*, E. von Dobschütz concluded in 1909 that the *Life's* chronology is largely if not totally fabricated.<sup>139</sup> In this respect it seems to be a work on the pattern of the Pseudo-Symeon. Though the Continuer of Theophanes also makes Theodore survive the persecution, he can have little authority, especially because he wrongly describes Theophanes as bishop

<sup>135</sup> The *Encomium* is unpublished (cf. *ibid.*, 117), but Mr. Jeffrey Featherstone has obligingly sent me a copy of his edition. When the brothers are interrogated, John is described as τὴν τοῦ θρόνου ἱσχὺν ἐπιθέμενος (fol. 271<sup>r</sup>); Theodore's death under Theophilus is described on fol. 277<sup>v</sup>. The *Metaphrastic Life* reports that the brothers were exiled to Apamea at the suggestion of John, who ruled the Church at that time (PG, 116, col. 680A) and that Theodore died before Theophilus (*ibid.*, col. 680B–C, cf. col. 681B).

<sup>136</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, 353; *Menologium Graecorum*, PG, 117, col. 229C.

<sup>137</sup> *Encomium*, fol. 278<sup>r</sup>; PG, 116, cols. 680C–681B. Though the *Metaphrastic Life* says that Theodore died a day earlier on the feast of St. Stephen (December 27), this date has probably been altered to make the two "martyrs" die on the same day. The *Encomium* says that Theophanes and others were "barely" (μόλις) allowed to care for the tomb, while the *Metaphrast* says that they were not even allowed to bury the coffin.

<sup>138</sup> Ed. F. I. Smit, in *IRAIK*, 11 (1906), 246.27–28 (the branding), 251.21–23 (Theodore's death), 251.34–252.4 (Theophanes' ordination), 252.31–32 (Theophanes' four years as bishop), and 253.13–17 (Theophanes' death).

<sup>139</sup> See E. von Dobschütz, "Methodios und die Studiten," *BZ*, 18 (1909), 88 and note 3. It does not necessarily follow that the *Life* is not early, as Ševčenko, *op. cit.*, 116, believes. However, it is not clear to me that the *Life of Michael* is not dependent on the *Encomium of St. Theodore*, rather than the other way around (cf. Ševčenko, *op. cit.*, 117), especially because the author of the *Encomium* explicitly states that he knows of no other written account of Theodore (fol. 257<sup>v</sup>). To the doubts of Dobschütz (*op. cit.*, 87–89) about the early date of the *Life of Michael*, I would add its author's failure to recognize the retired Empress Euphrosyne in the iconophile nun Euphrosyne who protected Michael Syncellus (238.22–23). On Euphrosyne, see Treadgold, "Problem," 338–40.

of Smyrna.<sup>140</sup> In short, the dates implied by the Logothete and the other sources should be accepted. As for the date at which Theophanes became metropolitan of Nicaea, the most likely year is 843 with the accession of Methodius and the triumph of Orthodoxy, though the year 842 has usually been adopted in a vain attempt to save the chronology of the *Life of Michael Syncellus*.<sup>141</sup>

Next, the Logothete tells how the crest of the statue of Justinian on a pillar in the Augustaeum fell down. It was replaced by a workman who cast a rope to it from the roof of St. Sophia, which he climbed to the admiration of spectators. The man was rewarded by Theophilus with a hundred nomismata. This event, which cannot be dated independently, is presumably the source of a garbled story in Michael the Syrian telling how the statue of "Augustus Caesar" on a pillar had its fallen crest replaced at the time when Leo V's patriarch supposedly invented the heresy of worshipping images.<sup>142</sup> If so, one of Dionysius of Tellmahre's unreliable informants told him about it before Dionysius' death in 845.<sup>143</sup> According to Symeon's order, the real event took place after the branding of the *Grapti* and before the coronation of Michael III, the next entry. Mango has shown that the latter event took place in 840, and Grierson has plausibly conjectured that it took place on Pentecost (May 16).<sup>144</sup> The date at which Theophilus founded the Hospice of Theophilus, as mentioned in the next entry, cannot be independently determined. Presumably it was late 840 or 841, of course before Theophilus' death on January 20, 842, the last entry for the reign.<sup>145</sup>

In this last entry, the Logothete records that when the emperor was dying he feared that Theophobus might try to overthrow his infant son Michael III. Accordingly, he summoned Theophobus to the palace, imprisoned him in the Bucoleon, and finally had him quietly beheaded. Theophobus' body was buried in the monastery of Theophobia near the quarter of Narses. Both Genesius and the Continuer give the same story, only omitting the mention of the monastery, though Genesius mentions in passing that some say Theophobus was executed immediately after the Khurramite revolt.<sup>146</sup> Despite this relatively rare case of agreement among the Greek sources, Grégoire and others rejected this story in favor of one told by Michael the Syrian.<sup>147</sup> According to Michael, soon after the battle of Amorium Theophobus and his band of Khurramites were surprised by an Arab force in southeastern Asia Minor, killed to the last man, and beheaded. The Arab commander had the heads preserved in salt and sent to the caliph, who rewarded him handsomely.<sup>148</sup> This story is related in

<sup>140</sup> Theoph. Cont., 160.

<sup>141</sup> S. Vailhé, "Saint Michel le Syncelle et les deux frères Grapti," *ROChr*, 6 (1901), 632-33.

<sup>142</sup> Michael the Syrian, III, 71-72. This passage has been retranslated by S. Gero, "The Resurgence of Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Ninth Century According to a Syriac Source," *Speculum*, 51 (1976), 1-5.

<sup>143</sup> See *supra*, pp. 161-62.

<sup>144</sup> Grierson, *Catalogue*, III,1 (note 34 *supra*), 407.

<sup>145</sup> See *idem*, "Tombs" (note 9 *supra*), note 175.

<sup>146</sup> Genesius, 59-60, 61; Theoph. Cont., 136.

<sup>147</sup> Grégoire, "Manuel et Théophobe" (note 4 *supra*), 196-98.

<sup>148</sup> Michael the Syrian, III, 96.

Michael's *Chronicle* still under the year 1149 of the Seleucid era, which ended September 30, 838.

Even if this battle were assigned to the next year, it would still fall during the period of the Khurramite revolt, of which Michael seems to know nothing. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that the Greek sources would have invented Theophobus' beheading in Constantinople on the basis of a report of his beheading by the Arabs near the border, as Grégoire proposed. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the Arab commander won a reward by presenting the caliph with a head that he claimed was Theophobus' though it was not. Michael himself notes that most of the salted heads turned out to be those of Arabs of Mopsuestia. According to Grégoire, the monastery of Theophobia was originally dedicated simply to the Fear of God and only later adopted Theophobus, made up the story of his "martyrdom" under Theophilus, and claimed to have his body. But Janin has pointed out that Theophobus' house was in the quarter of Oxia, which adjoins the quarter of Narses just as the Logothete says the monastery of Theophobia did; Janin concluded that the monastery was founded in Theophobus' house or on his property, which seems to confirm the whole story.<sup>149</sup>

Such is the Logothete's history of the reign of Theophilus, which is, if the arguments presented here are correct, in perfect chronological order. But the process of checking should not stop with the year 842. Though Byzantine chroniclers often stopped writing at the ends of reigns, this is by no means a rule. In this particular case, we have seen that Symeon's source, on the assumption that he had only one, must have written after the spring of 845, when the martyrdom of the Amorion captives was known to the Byzantines.<sup>150</sup> Of course, the chronicler followed by Symeon might not have continued his chronicle up to the year he wrote, but the possibility that he continued it past 842 is worth examining.

Because we already know that most of Symeon's account of Michael III's reign is not chronologically accurate, we should not be surprised that Symeon makes an error in recording the length of Michael's reign with his mother Theodora. The Logothete writes that Michael reigned with Theodora for fifteen years, which would put Michael's proclamation as sole emperor in 857. But the right date seems to be March 15, 856, making the joint reign fourteen years, one month, and twenty-five days.<sup>151</sup> On the other hand, the Logothete's figures for Michael's reign alone (ten years), and for Michael's reign with Basil I (one year and four months) are correct.<sup>152</sup> Perhaps Symeon had to deduce the length of Michael's reign with his mother by subtracting these two figures from a correct figure of twenty-six years for Michael's entire reign, so that the rounding

<sup>149</sup> Janin, *op. cit.* (note 92 *supra*), 246; cf. Genesius, 53–54.

<sup>150</sup> See *supra*, p. 185.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Halkin, *op. cit.* (note 116 *supra*), 13.

<sup>152</sup> All sources agree that Basil was crowned on May 26, 866 (see Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 174–75) and that Michael was murdered on September 24, 867 (see Grierson, "Tombs," 57). Therefore, Michael reigned alone for ten years, two months, and eleven days, and with Basil for one year, three months, and twenty-eight days.

of the numbers caused his mistake. Although Symeon could not have taken these numbers from the highly reliable chronicle that he used for the reign of Theophilus, he could still have interpolated the numbers into it so as to follow his custom of beginning the histories of emperors by telling how long they reigned.

The Logothete's first entry for the reign of Michael III is Theodora's deposition and imprisonment of the Patriarch John and her designation of Methodius as his replacement on March 4, 843.<sup>153</sup> Immediately after this the *Chronicle* records the restoration of the icons on March 11. Agreeing with the older versions of this event, Symeon gives the credit for the restoration to Theodora. He adds that she deposed John on the advice of Theoctistus the Logothete; in support of this, early sources record that the synod that restored Orthodoxy was held at Theoctistus' house, and the *Synaxarium* lists Theoctistus as a saint.<sup>154</sup> Symeon's description shows no traces of the later version of the Continuer and others that Manuel, now dead for almost five years, was the principal force behind the reestablishment of Orthodoxy.<sup>155</sup> In short, Symeon's account of the restoration of the icons agrees with the best sources.

Next Symeon relates that Theodora sent Theoctistus against Arab-held Crete with a large force on the first Sunday of Lent (March 18, 843). When Theoctistus arrived, the Arabs were unable to stand against him in the field, but he soon returned to Constantinople in alarm at a false report that Theodora had chosen a new emperor. Without him, the Byzantine army was butchered by the Cretan Arabs. This story and its date have been generally accepted, though Grégoire thought that the Logothete's story put Theoctistus in too unfavorable a light.<sup>156</sup>

Symeon's source did not like Theoctistus, because he begins his next entry by saying of him, "Having thus made a bad showing in Crete, he was shown to be worse and unluckier after he returned from there."<sup>157</sup> Theoctistus, Symeon reports, was sent to oppose an Arab expedition into Asia Minor and was defeated with great loss at Mauropotamum. This battle must have taken place after Theoctistus' return from Crete in mid-843. About June of 845, Theodora sent an embassy to the Caliph Al-Wāthiq to offer an exchange of the prisoners taken in Theophilus' victorious campaign of 837; presumably the exchange was to be for the prisoners taken at Mauropotamum, because the remaining captives from Amorium had been martyred on March 6, 845, and any prisoners taken on Crete would not have been in the caliph's hands. When the exchange

<sup>153</sup> See Grumel, *La Chronologie* (note 24 *supra*), 436; Methodius was ordained on March 11.

<sup>154</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, 244.

<sup>155</sup> On the restoration of the icons, see Gouillard, "Le Synodicon" (note 109 *supra*), 122–23; and Mango, "Liquidation" (note 106 *supra*), 133–34.

<sup>156</sup> Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 194–95. See Grégoire, in *CMH*<sup>2</sup>, IV, 1, 106, who thinks that Theoctistus left Sergius Nicetiates behind as commander of the army; but note that according to the *Synaxarium CP*, 777–78, Grégoire's source, Sergius died on the expedition, which is compatible with Symeon's account.

<sup>157</sup> Τοῖς τε ἐν Κρήτῃ φαῦλος φανείς χείρων ἐφάνη καὶ δυστυχέστερος ἐκεῖθεν ὑποστράφεις: Interpolated George the Monk, Bonn ed., 815.5–7. Οὕτω δὲ κακῶς ἐν Κρήτῃ φανείς\*\*\*: Leo Gramm., 229.9–10.

took place, more than four thousand Byzantines were redeemed.<sup>158</sup> Therefore, the battle of Maupotamum probably took place in the campaigning season of 843 or 844, as Bury and Vasiliev believed, perhaps rather in 843, since this would explain why Theoctistus did not return to Crete when he discovered that the rumor about a new emperor was false.<sup>159</sup> The timing of the embassy of 845 was presumably determined not by the recent date of the battle but by concern for the captives' lives at the news of the martyrdom of the Amorians.<sup>160</sup>

Symeon observes that at Maupotamum some Byzantines deserted to the Arabs out of hatred for Theoctistus, and that among these deserters was the valiant Theophanes Pharganus, who returned to the Empire "some years later" under a pledge of immunity. This reference to Theophanes' return is, of course, a cast forward.<sup>161</sup> Theophanes returned no later than 855, when he helped Bardas murder Theoctistus, as Symeon recounts later in his *Chronicle*.<sup>162</sup> There, however, some versions of the *Chronicle*, including Leo the Grammarian's and the very early Pseudo-Symeon, spell "Pharganus" with an "l" instead of an "r," possibly indicating that Symeon copied the misspelling from a different source.<sup>163</sup> The spelling "Pharganus," meaning that Theophanes was one of the band of Faraghanese Turks serving as imperial bodyguards, is certainly right.<sup>164</sup>

When Theoctistus returned to the capital after his defeat at Maupotamum, according to Symeon he accused Theodora's brother Bardas of complicity in the desertions and had Theodora exile him from the city. Though only the Logothete mentions the exile explicitly, Patricia Karlin-Hayter has shown that the accounts of Theoctistus' murder given by Genesius and the Continuer make sense only on the assumption that Bardas had been exiled.<sup>165</sup> To judge from Bardas' and Theophanes' later complicity in murdering Theoctistus, the latter's suspicions against Bardas may have had some foundation. Bardas' exile followed the battle of Maupotamum in either 843 or 844.

Now the Logothete records that Theoctistus, secure in his favor with Theodora, built himself a palace with a bath and a park in the Apsis, a place inside

<sup>158</sup> See Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 198–204. Though Wāthiq bought up additional Byzantines (*ibid.*, 201), in the end he had far more prisoners to exchange than the Byzantines had, according to an account given by Ṭabarī which says that 100 more Byzantines were released as a favor and the remainder sold into slavery (*ibid.*, 314–15).

<sup>159</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 274 note 4, dates the battle to 843 or 844; Vasiliev, *Byzance*, 196 note 1, dates it to 844, but since this date is taken from the Pseudo-Symeon, it has no authority.

<sup>160</sup> In my forthcoming book, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (DOS, XVIII), I discuss the chronology of this embassy and argue that it was the embassy to which Photius had been appointed when he composed his *Bibliotheca*.

<sup>161</sup> Theod. Mel., 160; interpolated George, Bonn ed., 815, and ed. Murlalt, 722, says that Theophanes returned ὕστερον χρόνοις τισι ("some years later"); Leo Gramm., 229, has simply ὕστερον ("later"); and *Vat. Gr.* 1807, 59r, has ὕστερον χρόνῳ (sic) τιῇ ("some time later").

<sup>162</sup> Leo Gramm., 235–36; for the date (November 20, 855), see Halkin, *op. cit.* (note 112 *supra*), 11–14.

<sup>163</sup> All versions read Φαργάνων in the description of Theophanes' desertion; Leo Gramm., 236, and Theod. Mel., 164, read Φαλγάνων in the description of the murder; Ps.-Sym., 657, reads Φαλγάνων; and *Vat. Gr.* 1807, fol. 61r, and the interpolated George (Bonn ed., 821, and ed. Murlalt, 729) read Φαργάνων; this is, however, the sort of obvious correction that even a scribe could make.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. N. Oikonomides, *Les Listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1972), 327 and note 237.

<sup>165</sup> *Op. cit.* (note 110 *supra*), 466–68.

the enclosure of the Great Palace.<sup>166</sup> The construction of the Apsis Palace seems to date to soon after Bardas' exile, when Theoctistus was definitely established as Theodora's principal adviser. We may date its construction to about 844. So far the *Chronicle's* chronological sequence is maintained.

Although the next entry in the *Chronicle* does not break this sequence, there can be little doubt that it was not part of the source that Symeon began using with Theophilus' reign. This entry describes the marriage of Michael III, dated by Bury to 855, when Michael was fifteen.<sup>167</sup> The Logothete begins the description by noting that Michael had "already" reached manhood, which implies that he was grown at the time of the previous events, though he was only four in 844. In fact, from this point on the Logothete seems to have lost his chronological bearings completely. After Michael's marriage he inserts a long digression on the early career of Basil the Macedonian, for which his reference point was presumably Basil's rise in the late 850's, and after that he mentions the death of the Patriarch Methodius and the elevation of Ignatius, which occurred on June 14 and July 3 of 847, respectively.<sup>168</sup> After this comes an entry on an expedition sent by Theodora against the Bulgarians sometime between 845 and 852.<sup>169</sup> This is followed by the entry on the murder of Theoctistus in 855. From 856 to 867, as was mentioned at first, Jenkins found that the Logothete's account "is full of chronological incongruities."<sup>170</sup> For the twenty years from 847 to 867 the Logothete was evidently working without a chronologically reliable source.

The last precisely datable event in Symeon's chronologically reliable source was the martyrdom of the Amorian prisoners on March 6, 845. But its author must have written somewhat later than that, after Theophanes Pharganus returned to Byzantium between the late 840's and 855. In fact, it seems plain that our chronicler could not safely have made his uncomplimentary remarks about Theoctistus before Theoctistus was assassinated in 855. On the other hand, he could not have written later than 865/66, when John the Grammarian's old palace was no longer vacant, as our chronicle said it was. Thus, we may date this chronicle to about 860, calling it Chronicle B.

As far as Symeon's version can show, the author of Chronicle B was an iconophile, probably connected with court circles, and evidently no friend of Theoctistus, though he did not conceal Theoctistus' part in restoring the icons. Our chronicler had detailed and apparently accurate information about Theophilus' bridesshow, judicial actions, projects for redecoration and building, and court intrigues. His information on Theophilus' military activities is accurate but less detailed. He can describe how spectators admired the workman who replaced the fallen crest of the statue of Justinian, and he knows how much Theophilus paid for the work. The disparaging remark about Theoctistus is his and not Symeon's, because Symeon's later account of Theoctistus' murder

<sup>166</sup> Cf. R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1964), 117, 313.

<sup>167</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 157 note 1; cf. Mango, "Eudocia" (note 93 *supra*), 19.

<sup>168</sup> Grumel, *La Chronologie* (note 24 *supra*), 436.

<sup>169</sup> Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 372-73.

<sup>170</sup> Jenkins, *op. cit.* (note 5 *supra*), 95.



is sympathetic to Theoctistus and unsympathetic to Bardas, as Patricia Karlin-Hayter has pointed out.<sup>171</sup>

The author of Chronicle B evidently worked from a series of annals, but he made such frequent use of casts forward and casts back, with seven of the former and two of the latter, that his chronicle was more often a connected narrative than a listing of unrelated entries. He was a considerably more complete and more sophisticated chronicler than the author of Chronicle A. On the other hand, since he seems to have begun his work abruptly with 829 and followed the same general method as Chronicle A, the chances are that he wrote his composition as a continuation of that chronicle, and that the Logothete found both chronicles in sequence in one manuscript. The practice of beginning a history of more recent times after another historian left off was common in Byzantium. For example, Nicephorus continued Theophylact Simocatta, and Genesius and Theophanes Continuatus continued Theophanes. Manuscripts often include a chronicle and its continuation.

The writers of both chronicles ended their works considerably earlier than the times when they actually wrote. Possibly the author of Chronicle B was writing during the Photian controversy (thus after 858), and found it safer to stop before the beginning of the patriarchate of Ignatius (847), about which comment might be dangerous. Possibly the author of Chronicle A was writing under the regency of Theodora (thus before 855), and found it politic not to discuss the reign of Theophilus, whom he can hardly have approved but she did not want criticized. At all events, a date about 850 seems most likely for Chronicle A, leaving time for it to be used by George the Monk and to be continued by the author of Chronicle B.

Having found a good source in Chronicle B, the Logothete evidently limited himself to it for its period, just as he had done with Chronicle A. The absence of errors in his chronological sequence is the best proof of this. But, finding no indications of any absolute dates within the reigns of emperors, the Logothete sometimes became chronologically confused by his source's many casts forward and casts back. He does not seem to have realized that Manuel's desertion to the Arabs took place seven years before his campaign with Theophilus against Zapetra, and writes as if it had been a recent event. He seems not to have recognized the battle of Anzen (never specifically named in his *Chronicle*) when it appeared in his source for the second time, in a cast back from the sack of Amorium. He did not understand that the captives of Amorium were martyred seven years after they were captured in 838, because he says that the student of Leo the Mathematician avoided their fate at that time by finding favor with the caliph. As I have already argued, Symeon seems to have misinterpreted Theophilus' betrothal of his infant daughter to Alexius Musele as a marriage, evidently because the Logothete had lost his chronological place and did not realize that Theophilus, having married in 830, could not yet have had a daughter of marriageable age.<sup>172</sup>

<sup>171</sup> *Op. cit.*, 466–69.

<sup>172</sup> See *supra*, p. 176.

We have also seen that Symeon misreported one of the names of the martyrs of Amorium and continued to make the error that Euphrosyne was Theophilus' real mother.<sup>173</sup> Finally, the Logothete is presumably mistaken when he says that Theophilus exiled the archbishop of Syracuse, Theodore Crithinus, not only because he defended Alexius Musele but because he was an iconophile; Jean Gouillard has shown that Theodore was an iconoclast.<sup>174</sup> Still, it is not too surprising that Symeon thought a bishop persecuted by Theophilus would have been an iconophile. As a rule, Symeon followed his source closely, even including its outdated report that the Trullus Palace was still uninhabited. We may take it that the Logothete transmitted the text of Chronicle B with only minor modifications—though we should be on our guard for these—and transmitted its sequence of events without any alteration.

The alternative to my conclusion that Symeon relied exclusively on two early and reliable sources arranged in chronological order is to suppose that Symeon himself took some part in arranging his material in what he believed was chronological order. On this supposition, confidence could not be placed in all the controversial dates that follow from Symeon's sequence, namely, the dating of the flight of Thomas the Slav to 821 rather than earlier, of Theophilus' marriage to 830 rather than 821, of the flight of Manuel to 829/30 rather than earlier, of the accession of John the Grammarian to 838 rather than 837, of the death of Manuel to 838 rather than *ca.* 860, of the Khurramite revolt to 838–39 and not just to 838, of the caliph's invitation to Leo the Mathematician to 838 rather than 829/33, of the branding of the *Grapti* to 839 rather than 836, of the death of St. Theodore to 840 rather than after 842, and of the death of Theophobus to 842 rather than *ca.* 839.

In each of these cases there can be no question of Symeon's having simply misplaced his entries, because the dates follow from his account and practically always from the evidence of at least one independent source. If the sequence is wrong, it must still be the result of historical research of some intelligence and knowledgeability. But the Logothete shows absolutely no signs of having done any such research for this part of his *Chronicle*. On the contrary, he sometimes misunderstands at what dates events occurred even when he gives their entries in the right order, and between the end of Chronicle B in about 845 and the beginning of the annals identified by Jenkins in 867 Symeon makes repeated and glaring chronological errors. His apparent accuracy before 845 cannot be the result of his perspicacity, and still less of his luck.

If, then, Symeon faithfully transmitted two early and reliable sources, the importance of this fact extends far beyond chronology. In these virtually transcribed chronicles we have sources that are earlier in date even than George the Monk, and much superior to him in interest. They demonstrate that Byzantine historiography did not decline to George's level after producing the works of

<sup>173</sup> See *supra*, pp. 185 and 171.

<sup>174</sup> Leo Gramm., 217.20–22; cf. J. Gouillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclisme," *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 387–401, especially 394–96. It would probably be overly subtle to see Theodore as a sort of radical moderate who was exiled for defending the voluntary veneration of images under Theophilus but condemned for opposing the compulsory veneration of images under Theodora.

Nicephorus, Theophanes, and the Scriptor Incertus. Chronicle B is, if anything, on a higher plane than Nicephorus and Theophanes, for it is considerably more extensive than the former and more analytic and impartial than the latter. To a markedly greater extent than Theophanes, the author of Chronicle B connects the causes and effects of historical events and tells the good as well as the bad about figures like Theophilus and Theoctistus. From him we learn that Theophilus gave the same justice to all regardless of family or class but was unduly suspicious of his generals, and that Theoctistus advised Theodora to depose the infamous John the Grammarian but fought incompetently against the Arabs. The chronicler could have suppressed one side or the other, but he did not.

This is not the place to present more than a bare outline of the effect of this new understanding of Symeon's work on our picture of the second iconoclastic period. Several points in particular stand out. We learn that Theophilus spent lavishly on buildings throughout his reign, constructing the Triclinium of the Pearl in 829 or 830, sumptuously redecorating the Sacred Palace in 834/36, building the Bryas Palace in 837, making vast additions to the Sacred Palace in 838/39 even after the disaster at Amorium, and founding a hospice in 840/41. Given that Theophilus nonetheless left a large surplus in the treasury to Theodora in 842, this building program is less a sign of his extravagance than of the Empire's wealth, which must date from before his reign.<sup>175</sup> Further, we learn that there were two stages in Theophilus' persecution of iconophiles, the first beginning in 832/33 and the second beginning with the accession of John the Grammarian in 838 and including the branding of the *Grapti* the next year. We also learn that the Khurramite revolt of 838–39 was long and serious, and no doubt aggravated the Empire's military difficulties after the defeat at Anzen and the sack of Amorium. We now can be sure that Manuel died in 838 and that his whole career in the 840's and 850's is spurious, including his leading part in restoring the icons. We also learn for certain that Alexius Musele brought his army not to Benevento but to Sicily. We learn that Theophilus discovered Leo the Mathematician and established him in the Magnaura in 838, so that Bardas' appointment of Leo and others to the Magnaura in 843 was at most a restoration of that famous school. Finally, to sum up all these and many other points, at last we have a narrative source for the second period of Iconoclasm on which we can rely.

No ultimate confidence can be placed in the sort of series of conjectures that has previously been assembled for this period, because the conjectures are based on sources whose accuracy cannot be checked or on judgments of plausibility in the absence of good evidence. Such conjectures cannot reinforce one another; when one is based on another, the conclusions become more dubious with every step. But if the argument presented here is valid (and it is, in the phrase of Jenkins, "either right or wrong"), the conjectures made in the course of it do reinforce one another, because each of them builds a case that the

<sup>175</sup> On his and Theodora's surplus, see Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 231 (note at end).

chronology of the Logothete is the result of his following sources with accurate information. We do have a means of checking the value of the Logothete's *Chronicle*, and if the scheme given in the tables in this study is correct, the *Chronicle* passes every test. Consequently, it should not be judged by comparison with other sources that are of dubious value, but those sources should be judged by comparison with it. In sum, the common opinion that all our narrative sources for the Amorian period are late and unreliable overestimates the problem. Two consecutive sources that are early, reliable, and chronologically arranged have been virtually preserved in the *Chronicle* of Symeon the Logothete.

Institut für Byzantinistik  
Munich